

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT, FY 2007-08
CHEMISTRY**

Introduction

A review panel in chemistry, consisting of Dr. Roger Hawk (chair), professor emeritus, University of Arkansas Little Rock; Dr. Sheila Browne, Mount Holyoke College; and Dr. J. Thomas Brenna, Cornell University, met March 2-3, 2008, in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty-three (43) proposals submitted through the Traditional Enhancement Program component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: (1) the 43 proposals and their appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals submitted listing titles, PIs and their institutions, funds requested, and so forth; (3) the appropriate RFP containing criteria for evaluation; and (4) a copy of the most recent Chemistry (2005) report. After studying all proposals, the panel met in Baton Rouge to review and evaluate them. During the review each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria enumerated in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of funding.

A total of 43 proposals from 19 different institutions requesting \$5,081,765 in funding were submitted. This report contains three tables that rank and score all proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals that were highly recommended for funding with the recommended funding levels. Table II contains proposals recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Proposals not recommended for funding were placed in Table III. This year ten proposals were deemed not to be sufficiently related to chemistry; for these the panel recommended resubmission in the proper funding cycle when the primary discipline of the particular proposal is eligible. These are listed at the bottom of Table III.

A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. 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.

Of the 16 proposals highly recommended for funding, 10 were recommended for full funding and six for partial funding. Two of the proposals recommended to receive partial funding (010CHE-08 and 042CHE-08) are recommended for full funding if additional money becomes available. That funding should take precedence over prospective funding for the proposals listed in Table II.

TABLE I
CHEMISTRY

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	94	006CHE-08	LSU-BR	\$129,265	\$129,265		
2	93	007CHE-08	LSU-S	\$72,432	\$72,432		
2	93	018CHE-08	NICHOLLS	\$25,000	\$25,000		
4	88	015CHE-08	LOYOLA	\$192,085	\$192,085		
5	87	011CHE-08	LA TECH	\$54,475	\$31,080		
6	86	041CHE-08	UNO	\$194,980	\$194,980		
7	85	008CHE-08	LSU-S	\$122,559	\$29,634		
7	85	030CHE-08	TULANE	\$115,244	\$115,244		
7	85	036CHE-08	ULM	\$81,060	\$81,060		
7	85	042CHE-08*	UNO	\$182,547	\$156,573		
11	84	010CHE-08*	LA TECH	\$55,950	\$31,440		
12	82	009CHE-08	LSU-S	\$98,500	\$89,878		
12	82	012CHE-08	LA TECH	\$57,100	\$57,100		
14	76	031CHE-08	TULANE	\$112,910	\$112,910		
15	74	025CHE-08	SLU	\$200,000	\$88,500	\$0	\$0
16	73	005CHE-08	LSU-BR	\$33,270	\$33,270		
			TOTALS:	\$1,727,377	\$1,440,451	\$0	\$0

*To be fully funded if additional monies become available.

TABLE II
CHEMISTRY

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
17	72	039CHE-08	UNO	\$135,858	\$135,858
18	71	040CHE-08	UNO	\$203,310	\$203,310
			TOTALS:	\$339,168	\$339,168

TABLE III
CHEMISTRY
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
19	69	029CHE-08	SUBR	\$91,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	67	027CHE-08	SUBR	\$75,400	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	66	032CHE-08	ULL	\$147,675	\$0		
22	64	013CHE-08	LA TECH	\$129,281	\$0		
22	64	033CHE-08	ULL	\$77,949	\$0		
22	64	043CHE-08	UNO	\$167,160	\$0		
25	59	028CHE-08	SUBR	\$54,864	\$0	\$0	\$0
26	56	026CHE-08	SUBR	\$64,652	\$0	\$0	\$0
27	55	004CHE-08	LSU-AG	\$230,475	\$0		
28	50	022CHE-08	NORTHWESTERN	\$249,964	\$0	\$0	\$0
29	47	002CHE-08	DILLARD	\$127,774	\$0		
30	45	016CHE-08	MCNEESE	\$80,000	\$0		
31	40	019CHE-08	NICHOLLS	\$26,088	\$0		
31	40	020CHE-08	NICHOLLS	\$70,000	\$0		
33	25	023CHE-08	NUNEZ	\$212,655	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		001CHE-08	DILLARD	\$81,653	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		003CHE-08	LSU-AG	\$97,494	\$0	\$0	\$0
NOT SCORED*		014CHE-08	LUMCON	\$84,432	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		017CHE-08	NICHOLLS	\$66,128	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		021CHE-08	NICHOLLS	\$85,200	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		024CHE-08	PENNINGTON	\$509,028	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		034CHE-08	ULM	\$12,468	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		035CHE-08	ULM	\$100,530	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		037CHE-08	ULM	\$110,000	\$0		
NOT SCORED*		038CHE-08	ULM	\$63,150	\$0		
			TOTALS:	\$3,015,220	\$0	\$0	\$0

* The panel recommends that proposals rated as NOT SCORED be resubmitted in another cycle in a discipline other than chemistry.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby Broadway

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrumental Tools for Enhanced Teaching of Biomolecular
Science

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$81,653

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 was not scored, as the panel deemed it ineligible. It is central to the biological sciences, specifically molecular biology, and other related disciplines outside the realm of chemistry.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonya Caston

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Instrumental Analysis Laboratory for Instruction
and Research—Phase I

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 2 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (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 5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

47

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 15 points)
B.3 5 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 4 (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: \$127,774
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 addresses and requests funding to purchase an LC-MS instrument at a cost of \$127,774. Few current students (only 12 chemistry majors) will benefit from this funding. The panel does not believe that the department could maintain this costly instrument. Additionally, the PI and Co-PIs have no research experience with this type of instrumentation. The department has a GC-MS and an HPLC which can support the research interests of the PI and Co-PIs. Funding for this project is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Todd F. Shupe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Bio-Based Processing Facilities at the
Louisiana Forest Products Development Center

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: NO SCORE (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

(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:	\$97,494	\$0
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$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 was not scored, as the panel deemed it ineligible. It is central to agricultural sciences and forestry, disciplines outside the realm of chemistry.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Qinglin Wu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Raman Spectroscopy for Applied Chemistry
Research and Development

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

55

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 5 (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 3 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$230,475
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 three PI/Co-PIs have requested a top-of-the-line Raman spectrometer. However, no PI/Co-PI has experience in bio-sample analysis using the instrument. The PIs do not explain how the instrument will be used. Further, not one paper was listed by the PI/Co-PIs in which they used Raman spectroscopy, and no assessment plan was provided. How will access to the instrument be regulated? Funding for this project is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Vadim Palshin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Micro-Focusing Silicon Mirrors and High
Performance Motion Controllers/Drivers for In Situ Studies of
Chemical Processes in Microreactors

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 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 _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$33,270
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$33,270

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

This project would provide enhanced capability for chemical reaction monitoring in a microfluidic mixing apparatus. The proposal is not well organized in the various categories, but the overall case was compelling. Recommended funds of \$33,270 should support several aspects of chemical studies.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: George G. Stanley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Polarimetry, Optical Rotatory Dispersion, and Reaction IR Spectroscopic Equipment

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)

H. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (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 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 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: \$129,265
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$129,265

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 requesting funding to purchase optical equipment to replace existing, broken, or unserviceable equipment was well written. The PI makes a strong case for acquiring polarimetry, optical rotatory dispersion, and IR instrumentation. Significant ongoing research needs and course enhancement will be impacted. LSU has the staff and faculty expertise to use and maintain this equipment. Full funding of \$129,265 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elahe Mahdavian

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Biochemistry Laboratory Courses at LSUS

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)

H. Total Score:

93

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$72,432
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,432

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 was an excellent proposal for several pieces of equipment for the enhancement of the LSU-S biochemistry laboratory. The proposal is well thought out, well written, and comprehensive. The program at LSU-S is very impressive at every level. The commitment to teaching, active research with undergraduates, as well as outreach programs for minorities, female middle school students, and teacher training are truly outstanding. Given the expertise of the PIs/Co-PIs and their track record of using instruments for many different activities, it is clear that the requested instrumentation will be well used in courses, and for research and outreach. The institution pledges significant matching funds. Funding in full is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elahe Mahdavian

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Chemistry Laboratory Courses at LSUS

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 4 (of 5 points)

A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)

C.2 1 (of 1 point)

C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 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 4 (of 5 points)

B.2 14 (of 15 points)

B.3 17 (of 20 points)

B.4 3 (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 4 (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: \$122,559
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,634

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 justification for 2 HPLCs and 2 FT-IRs was not convincing. The necessity for replacing the 2 Matteson Satellite FT-IR spectrophotometers was not developed. Likewise, the necessity for the particle in a box apparatus was not made. Nevertheless, the panel recommends reduced funding of \$29,634 for one HPLC. Matching funds may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian A. Salvatore

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Bridging Molecular Modeling and Chemical Synthesis to
Enhance Inquiry-Based Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (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 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: \$98,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$89,878

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.)

Overall, the panel liked the goals of most of this proposal, since the PIs are qualified to accomplish all tasks outlined. The only weakness is in the focus of the projects. There seemed to be both experimental and modeling (computer) aspects to the project, but more detail was needed to indicate how much each component would contribute. Partial funding of \$89,878 is recommended for the microwave-assisted chemical synthesizer, the digital polarimeter, and the Discovery Studio Model 2.0 software. The institutional match for the equipment and software should be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marilyn B. Cox

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Infrared Spectroscopy Use in Undergraduate Organic
Chemistry Labs

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$55,950
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$31,440

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 well-written proposal requests funding to obtain three FT-IR spectrometers to enhance Louisiana Tech's undergraduate chemistry program. The current FT-IR is broken and the new instrumentation will enhance teaching in numerous courses. The faculty and staff are well prepared to use and maintain this equipment, and other programs will also be complemented with access to this instrumentation. Funding of \$31,440 is recommended for some of the cost of the FT-IRs. Matching funds for faculty release time should be maintained. Full funding of \$55,950 is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sven Eklund

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Analytical Chemistry and Instrumental
Analysis Labs

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$54,475
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$31,080

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 makes a strong case for funding of basic equipment to provide students with adequate support. The purchase of very reasonably priced fluorescence spectrometers is well justified. The PI has the expertise to oversee the implementation of research efforts that will be developed by undergraduate students. Partial funding of \$31,080 is recommended by reducing the total number of pH meters and analytical balances; however, the release time match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Ji

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Differential Scanning Calorimeters for Undergraduate and Graduate Laboratories and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$57,100
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$57,100

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

An existing 30-year-old DSC at Louisiana Tech is broken and cannot be repaired. The instrument is used with 160 undergraduate students in laboratories and for capstone senior projects. Because of the institution's strengths in micromanufacturing and related materials, teaching with DSC is well supported. Thus, the panel recommends full funding of \$57,100 for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Mills

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

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

64

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

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 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: \$129,281

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.)

A Raman microscope is requested. The proposal is vague regarding use of this instrument, and there is little connection between the specific projects or faculty research and the requested instrument. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian J. Roberts

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Biogeochemical Analytical Capabilities
at LUMCON

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$84,432
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 scope of this project was deemed to be outside the realm of chemistry and therefore the proposal is considered to be ineligible.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Spence

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Suite of Instruments to Enhance Forensic Science at Loyola

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (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 11 (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:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$192,085
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$192,085

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 strong proposal that could help move Loyola's chemistry program forward. The equipment is needed to match the capabilities of professional forensic labs. With the new instrumentation, the program should continue moving on a positive trajectory. Full funding of \$192,085 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016CHE-08

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joseph P. Emerson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Modernization of Chemistry Teaching and Student Research Program

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 0 (of 5 points)
A.3 0 (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)

H. Total Score:

45

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 5 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$80,000
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 was very weak in establishing connections between the requested equipment and the courses, experiments, and research to be accomplished. It was unclear until page 12 of the proposal what kind of equipment is being requested. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raj Boopathy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Environmental Chemistry Education at
Nicholls State University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,128
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 was not scored as it was deemed ineligible. It is central to biology. All of the PIs are faculty members in the Biological Sciences department, and all of the courses associated with the instrumentation requested are in biology.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: April Dupre

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: C:SI-REAL (Chemistry: Stimulating Interest Through Relevant Experiences in the Analytical Laboratory)

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)

H. Total Score:

93

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (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 4 (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: \$25,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$25,000

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 comprehensive proposal for an HPLC, an instrument that is clearly needed. The PI is an analytical chemist and has the expertise to utilize the instrument. The institution is providing \$2,500 in matching funds. The panel recommends funding in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn V. Lo

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Freshman Chemistry Laboratory with Fiber-Optic Spectrometers

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (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 3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

40

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 5 (of 15 points)
B.3 5 (of 20 points)
B.4 1 (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 9 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$26,088

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 fiber-optic spectrometer system would have limited impact for the amount of money requested. It would be used essentially for one experiment in general chemistry, and the concepts of the experiment are readily accessible with existing instrumentation. The PI currently uses an older fiber-optic spectrometer system in Physical Chemistry. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Biochemistry Experiences for Science Majors

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 2 (of 5 points)

A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (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 4 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)

B.2 5 (of 15 points)

B.3 10 (of 20 points)

B.4 1 (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 4 (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:

40

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,000
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.)

Approximately 20% of this grant was related to chemistry; the majority of the request was for the enhancement of the BIOL 155 laboratory. The proposal did not make a sufficient case for the instrumentation's enhancement of the chemistry curricula or its impact upon the chemistry discipline.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instrumental Capability for Heavy Metal Analysis

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$85,200

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 panel deemed this proposal to be outside of the realm of chemistry and, therefore, considered it ineligible for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Massimo D. Bezoari

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Undergraduate Chemistry Programs
with NMR Spectroscopy

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 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)

H. Total Score: 50 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

(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:	<u>\$249,964</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requested funding for a 400 MHz NMR. The researchers did not make the case that there were sufficient resources to maintain this instrument with regard to cryogen costs and required maintenance. This instrument would require a full-time electronics technician to be able to be used continuously. A realistic budget with these types of expenses listed should have been compiled. The researchers have NMR experience, but student utilization would be minimal (only 27 chemistry majors in the last five years). Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Chemistry in the Community College

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 2 (of 5 points)

A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (of 6 points)

C.2 0 (of 1 point)

C.3 1 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 3 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)

B.2 5 (of 15 points)

B.3 5 (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 0 (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:

25

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$212,655
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.)

Both of this proposal's PIs are biology instructors. There is no indication of what equipment is currently available in the "traditionally equipped labs." An extraordinarily large amount of money is requested for running "virtual experiments." It is not clear how doing virtual experiments will allow "students to do field experiments and find results for themselves using the latest equipment." The proposal should have involved faculty who currently teach chemistry, and there should have been an explanation relating the existing instrumentation to the proposed equipment. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Pennington Biomedical Research Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Indu Kheterpal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Nano Liquid-Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometer
for Selective Detection and Quantification of Small Molecules

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$509,028

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 was not scored as the panel deemed it central to the bio-medical sciences. Its goals and objectives as described in the proposal are almost non-existent. The work plan is a description of research rather than a work plan. How this instrument will be shared is not discussed. The panel found little evidence of how funding and acquisition of a \$509,028 LC-MS would enhance recognized eminence at the regional, national, or international level. Funding is not recommended. As written, the proposal would not have been recommended for funding even if it were directly related to chemistry research.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Debra D. Dolliver

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advancing Mass Spectrometry for Research Training and
Education at Southeastern Louisiana University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (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 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 74 (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:	<u>\$200,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$88,500</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 acquisition of a GCMS and an LCMS. SLU's GCMS is 16 years old and needs to be replaced by an instrument with enhanced capability. The impact of the instruments on the curriculum and instructional enhancement is not clearly described. The case is made for a recommendation of \$88,500 for the GCMS, but funding for an LCMS is not recommended. However, the institutional match for equipment and personnel training should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michelle O. Fletcher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Peptide Synthesis Capabilities for
the Purpose of Scientific Research and Teaching at
Southern University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4
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 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 5 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 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: 56 (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:	<u>\$64,652</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The case for the need for this instrument in courses is not made, and the request for a peptide synthesizer is primarily for the research of the SUBR PIs. The institution offered only \$500 in supplies as match. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy
Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern
University

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 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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (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 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: 67 (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:	<u>\$75,400</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal requests funding for an EDS upgrade for the resident SEM. The goals and rationale behind the proposed upgrade are explained. Its objectives and implementation routes were listed. However, the impact of the equipment on the curriculum and student instruction would be minimal. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Gas Chromatograph Mass Spectrometry Capabilities in the Chemical Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 2 (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 7 (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 8 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No X

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 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 59 (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:	<u>\$54,864</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This vague proposal stated no specific plans, and though there are many projects discussed, there are few details regarding use of the requested equipment in specific projects. The work plan and performance measures sections are missing, and subsequent sections under "b" are mislabeled. Further, there is no information regarding evaluation anywhere in the proposal. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029CHE-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Raman Spectroscopy Capabilities
in the Chemical Sciences for Research and Teaching
at Southern University

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 2 (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 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 X No _____

H. Total Score: 69 (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:	<u>\$91,200</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

Generally, this proposal is well written and has good objectives. The timeline for utilization was realistic. However, the assessment is almost non-existent, the curriculum impact discussion is underdeveloped and section B.6 is missing. Panel recommendation: this particular Raman system exhibits rather poor performance. It only has 3 cm⁻¹ resolution and the panel fears that the selected samples by the PIs will require a better instrument selection. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark J. Fink

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrade of Mass Spectrometry Facilities for Chemical Analysis

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 4 (of 5 points)

A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)

C.2 1 (of 1 point)

C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 6 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)

B.2 14 (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 11 (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:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$115,244
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$115,244

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 for mass spectrometry equipment is well thought out. The instruments will be useful in several different areas of chemical research and pedagogy at Tulane. Full funding of \$115,244 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031CHE-08

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Sulkes

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Construction of a Time Correlated Single Photon Counting System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 9 (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 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (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 9 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,910
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$112,910

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.)

A time-correlated photon single system for physical chemistry research is well justified to support the research and teaching of at least three researchers at Tulane. Full funding of \$112,910 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. D. K. Misra

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Thermal Analysis System to Support Polymer Science
Teaching and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

66

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$147,675
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 impact of the proposed thermal analysis system is primarily for the research of one of the PIs. The case for its use in teaching was not made. The description of the equipment requested did not give sufficient information for assessment and also did not allow for a recommendation of partial funding. Overall the proposal was deemed more central to chemical engineering and of less relevance to chemistry. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Radhey S. Srivastava

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Purchase of GC-MS Spectrophotometer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 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 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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 5 (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: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$77,949
 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 has excellent goals and objectives. The work plan is well described for the combination of research and teaching. The assessment plan is well written, and the PIs have a good outreach plan. However, the request for the GC-MS system is not sufficiently justified. There is no indication of its relationship to the GC-MS spectrometer which was acquired in 1993. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Khalid A. El Sayed

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A DigiStore Documentation System for Enhancement of ULM
Medicinal Chemistry Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score: NO SCORE (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$12,468

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 scope of this project is deemed to be outside the realm of chemistry and, therefore, the proposal was considered ineligible and not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Khalid A. El Sayed

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____

A.2 _____ (of 5 points)

A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 6 points)

C.2 _____ (of 1 point)

C.3 _____ (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 2 points)

E.2a _____ (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 5 points)

B.2 _____ (of 15 points)

B.3 _____ (of 20 points)

B.4 _____ (of 5 points)

B.5 _____ (of 2 points)

B.6 _____ (of 5 points)

B.7 Yes _____ No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: \$100,530
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 scope of this project was deemed to be outside the realm of chemistry and, therefore, ineligible. The proposal was not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Junk

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Introduction of Microwave Assisted Techniques to ULM's Chemistry Program

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$81,060

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$81,060

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 strong proposal the PI requested two microwave systems. The advantages and uses for this equipment in teaching labs and research were clearly represented. The panel recommends funding in full (\$81,060).

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Liu Yong-Yu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of Microarray Facility at ULM to Promote Drug
Discovery and Pharmacology Study

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$110,000

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.)

The scope of this project was deemed to be outside the realm of the chemistry discipline. As such, the proposal is ineligible and was not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Seetharama D. Satyanarayanajois

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Circular Dichroism Spectropolarimeter for Enhancing
Pharmaceutical Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score:

NO SCORE

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

Requested Amount:

\$63,150

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 was not scored as it was deemed central to the biomedical/health sciences, not chemistry.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard B. Cole

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Instrument for UNO-Chemistry

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

72

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$135,858
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$135,858 (if additional funds become available)

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

The UNO mass spectrometry facilities are currently strong. The present proposal is written to acquire a GC-MS and associated equipment to place another instrument in the facility in order to add additional capabilities. However, competing needs elsewhere and the range of instrumentation already available at UNO temper the panel's enthusiasm. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ferdinand P. Poudeu Poudeu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laser Flash Apparatus for High Temperature Determination of
Thermal Diffusivity of Materials

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

71

 (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 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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 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 _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$203,310
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$203,310 (if additional funds
become available)

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

An apparatus for assessment of thermal diffusivity for small devices is requested. The proposal suffers from overuse of jargon for a device that is relatively specialized. The instrument would aid several researchers, notably the PI, who is expert at its operation. Full funding of \$203,310 is recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin D. Stevens

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Purchase of a Single-Crystal X-ray Diffractometer for Structural
Studies in Medicinal and Materials Chemistry

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 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 11 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (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 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: \$194,980
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$194,980

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 proposal in which the goals and research objectives are well defined. The PIs/Co-PIs have expertise with utilization of x-ray diffraction instruments to enhance interpretation of the various areas of research delineated. This instrument will be dedicated to high-level research projects. One area that should have been addressed is the possibility of sharing the facility with other institutions in the New Orleans area. Nonetheless, full funding of \$194,980 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John B. Wiley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Multimode Scanning Probe Microscope for Effective Imaging
and Characterization of Advanced Materials

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

85

 (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 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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 11 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$182,547
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$156,573

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.)

A scanning probe microscope is requested to support several chemistry researchers. A basic instrument is currently in use; however, the requested unit has many more capabilities that will enable additional studies in various areas of the chemical sciences. Partial funding of \$156,573 to be expended at the PI's discretion is recommended, with the remainder of the request (\$25,974) to be funded if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043CHE-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John B. Wiley

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Thermal Analysis System for Materials Characterization at the University of New Orleans

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

H. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (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 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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$167,160
 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.)

A thermal analysis system is requested. The instrument may be used by several UNO faculty groups in chemistry and related disciplines. Relative to other requests from UNO, this device is not expected to enhance programs in chemistry to a high degree. No funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Chemistry
for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001CHE-08 CHE	Instrumental Tools for Enhanced Teaching of Biomolecular Science	Dillard University (Natural Sciences and Public Health);	Ruby Broadway; Sonya Caston;	1	\$ 81,653
				Total	\$ 81,653
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002CHE-08 CHE	Enhancing the Instrumental Analysis Laboratory for Instruction and Research-Phase I	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Sonya Caston; Gail Cesar; Lovell Agwaramgbo; Ruby Broadway;	1	\$ 127,774
				Total	\$ 127,774
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
003CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of Bio-Based Processing Facilities at the Louisiana Forest Products Development Center	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Renewable Natural Resources);	Todd F. Shupe;	1 2	\$ 97,494 \$
E				Total	\$ 97,494
Proposal is a New Request					
004CHE-08 CHE	Advanced Raman Spectroscopy for Applied Chemistry Research and Development	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Renewal Natural Resources);	Qinglin Wu; Donghui Zhang; Kun Lian;	1	\$ 230,475
E				Total	\$ 230,475
Proposal is a New Request					
005CHE-08 CHE	Acquisition of Micro-Focusing Silicon Mirrors and High Performance Motion Controllers/Drivers for In Situ Studies of Chemical Processes in Microreactors	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices (CAMD));	Vadim Palshin; Challa Kumar; Josef Hormes;	1	\$ 33,270
E				Total	\$ 33,270
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006CHE-08 CHE	Polarimetry, Optical Rotatory Dispersion, and Reaction IR Spectroscopic Equipment	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	George G. Stanley; Carol M. Taylor; Donghui Zhang;	1	\$ 129,265
				Total	\$ 129,265
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
007CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of the Biochemistry Laboratory Courses at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Chemistry and Physics);	Elahe Mahdavian; M. Cran Lucas; Richard E. Thompson;	1	\$ 72,432
				Total	\$ 72,432
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
008CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of the Chemistry Laboratory Courses at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Chemistry and Physics);	Elahe Mahdavian; Brian A. Salvatore; Cynthia J. Sisson; Richard E. Thompson;	1	\$ 122,559
				Total	\$ 122,559
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009CHE-08 CHE	Bridging Molecular Modeling and Chemical Synthesis to Enhance Inquiry-Based Learning	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Chemistry and Physics);	Brian A. Salvatore; Elahe Mahdavian;	1	\$ 98,500
				Total	\$ 98,500
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
010CHE-08 CHE	Infrared Spectroscopy Use in Undergraduate Organic Chemistry Labs	Louisiana Tech University (Chemistry);	Marilyn B. Cox;	1	\$ 55,950
				Total	\$ 55,950
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
011CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of the Analytical Chemistry and Instrumental Analysis Labs	Louisiana Tech University (Chemistry);	Sven Eklund;	1	\$ 54,475
				Total	\$ 54,475
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012CHE-08 CHE	Acquisition of Differential Scanning Calorimeters for Undergraduate and Graduate Laboratories and Research	Louisiana Tech University (Chemistry);	Frank Ji; Bala Ramachandran; Scott Gold; Tabbetha Dobbins; Upali Siriwardane;	1	\$ 57,100
				Total	\$ 57,100
E	Proposal is a New Request				
013CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Education in Chemistry, Biological Sciences and Nanotechnology Through Practical Training	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing, Chemistry, and Biological Sciences);	David Mills; Alfred Gunasekaran; Sidney Sit; Tabbetha Dobbins;	1	\$ 129,281
				Total	\$ 129,281
E	Proposal is a New Request				
014CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of Biogeochemical Analytical Capabilities at LUMCON	Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium (Marine Center);	Brian J. Roberts; Michael J. Dagg; Nancy N. Rabalais; Rodney T. Powell;	1	\$ 84,432
				Total	\$ 84,432
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015CHE-08 CHE	A Suite of Instruments to Enhance Forensic Science at Loyola	Loyola University New Orleans (Chemistry);	Thomas Spence; Joelle Underwood; Kurt Birdwhistell; William Walkenhorst;	1	\$ 192,085
				Total	\$ 192,085
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
016CHE-08 CHE	Modernization of Chemistry Teaching and Student Research Program	McNeese State University (Chemistry);	Joseph P. Emerson;	1	\$ 80,000
				Total	\$ 80,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
017CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of Environmental Chemistry Education at Nicholls State University	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Raj Boopathy; Enmin Zou; Gary Lafleur; John Doucet;	1	\$ 66,128
				Total	\$ 66,128
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018CHE-08 CHE	C:SI-REAL (Chemistry: Stimulating Interest Through Relevant Experiences in the Analytical Laboratory)	Nicholls State University (Physical Sciences);	April Dupre;	1	\$ 25,000
				Total	\$ 25,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
019CHE-08 CHE	Enhancing Freshman Chemistry Laboratory with Fiber-Optic Spectrometers	Nicholls State University (Physical Sciences);	Glenn V. Lo; Yusheng Dou;	1	\$ 26,088
				Total	\$ 26,088
E	Proposal is a New Request				
020CHE-08 CHE	Enhancing Biochemistry Experiences for Science Majors	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Rajkumar Nathaniel; David L. Shultz; Duane M. Smith;	1	\$ 70,000
				Total	\$ 70,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021CHE-08 CHE	Enhancing Instrumental Capability for Heavy Metal Analysis	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Enmin Zou; Gary LaFleur; Raj Boopathy;	1	\$ 85,200
				Total	\$ 85,200
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
022CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of the Undergraduate Chemistry Programs with NMR Spectroscopy	Northwestern State University (Scholars College);	Massimo D. Bezoari; Darrell Fry; Gillian Rudd; Margaret Cochran; Walter Flomer;	1 2	\$ 249,964 \$
				Total	\$ 249,964
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
023CHE-08 CHE	Enhancing Chemistry in the Community College	Nunez Community College (Health and Natural Science);	Stephen Waddell; Klaus Heyer;	1	\$ 212,655
				Total	\$ 212,655
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024CHE-08 CHE	A Nano Liquid-Chromatography - Tandem Mass Spectrometer for Selective Detection and Quantification of Small Molecules	Pennington Biomedical Research Center (Proteomics Core Facility);	Indu Kheterpal;	1	\$ 509,028
				Total	\$ 509,028
E	Proposal is a New Request				
025CHE-08 CHE	Advancing Mass Spectrometry for Research Training and Education at Southeastern Louisiana University	Southeastern Louisiana University (Chemistry & Physics);	Debra D. Dolliver; Ju Chou; Michael Doughty; Phillip D. Voegel;	1 2	\$ 200,000 \$
				Total	\$ 200,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
026CHE-08 CHE	The Enhancement of Peptide Synthesis Capabilities for the Purpose of Scientific Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Michelle O. Fletcher Claville; Rao Uppu; Wesley Gray;	1 2	\$ 64,652 \$
				Total	\$ 64,652
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
027CHE-08 CHE	The Enhancement of Energy Dispersive Spectroscopy Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Karen Crosby; Yadong Qi;	1 2 .	\$ 75,400 \$
E				Total	\$ 75,400
Proposal is a New Request					
028CHE-08 CHE	The Enhancement of Gas Chromatograph Mass Spectrometry Capabilities in the Chemical Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Michelle O. Claville; Sylvester Burton;	1 2 .	\$ 54,864 \$
E				Total	\$ 54,864
Proposal is a New Request					
029CHE-08 CHE	The Enhancement of Raman Spectroscopy Capabilities in the Chemical Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Kinesha Harris; Michelle O. Claville;	1 2 .	\$ 91,200 \$
E				Total	\$ 91,200
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
030CHE-08 CHE	Upgrade of Mass Spectrometry Facilities for Chemical Analysis	Tulane University (Science and Engineering);	Mark J. Fink; James Donahue; Janarthanan Jayawickramarajah; Russell Schmehl; Scott Grayson;	1	\$ 115,244
				Total	\$ 115,244
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
031CHE-08 CHE	Construction of a Time Correlated Single Photon Counting System	Tulane University (Chemistry);	Mark Sulkes; Russell Schmehl; William Wimley;	1	\$ 112,910
				Total	\$ 112,910
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
032CHE-08 CHE	Thermal Analysis System to Support Polymer Science Teaching and Research	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemical Engineering);	R. D. K. Misra; August A. Gallo; K. A. Knierim; Radhey S. Srivastava;	1	\$ 147,675
				Total	\$ 147,675
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
033CHE-08 CHE	Purchase of GC-MS Spectrophotomer	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemistry);	Radhey S. Srivastava; August A. Gallo;	1	\$ 77,949
				Total	\$ 77,949
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
034CHE-08 CHE	A DigiStore Documentation System for Enhancement of ULM Medicinal Chemistry Research	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Khalid A. El Sayed;	1	\$ 12,468
				Total	\$ 12,468
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
035CHE-08 CHE	Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometer	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Khalid A. El Sayed; Ronald A. Hill; Seetharama D. Satyanarayanajois;	1	\$ 100,530
				Total	\$ 100,530
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
036CHE-08 CHE	Introduction of Microwave Assisted Techniques to ULM's Chemistry Program	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Chemistry);	Thomas Junk; Harry O. Brotherton;	1	\$ 81,060
				Total	\$ 81,060
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
037CHE-08 CHE	Establishment of Microarray Facility at ULM to Promote Drug Discovery and Pharmacology Study	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Liu Yong-Yu; Girish V. Shah; Harihara M. Mehendale; Karen Briski; Paul W. Sylvester;	1	\$ 110,000
				Total	\$ 110,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
038CHE-08 CHE	Circular Dichroism Spectropolarimeter for Enhancing Pharmaceutical Research	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Seetharama D. Satyanarayanajois; Alamdar Hussein; Girish V. Shah; Khalid A. El Sayed; Liu Yong-Yu; Sami Nazzal;	1	\$ 63,150
				Total	\$ 63,150
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
039CHE-08 CHE	Acquisition of a Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Instrument for UNO-Chemistry	University of New Orleans (Chemistry);	Richard B. Cole; Bernard B. Rees; Bruce C. Gibb; Matthew A. Tarr; Yang Cai;	1	\$ 135,858
				Total	\$ 135,858
E	Proposal is a New Request				
040CHE-08 CHE	Laser Flash Apparatus for High Temperature Determination of Thermal Diffusivity of Materials	University of New Orleans (Advanced Materials Research Institute and Chemistry);	Ferdinand P. Poudeu Poudeu; Heike Gabrisch; John B. Wiley; Kelvin Stokes; Paul Schilling;	1	\$ 203,310
				Total	\$ 203,310
E	Proposal is a New Request				
041CHE-08 CHE	Purchase of a Single-Crystal X-ray Diffractometer for Structural Studies in Medicinal and Materials Chemistry	University of New Orleans (Chemistry);	Edwin D. Stevens; Branko S. Jursic; Bruce C. Gibb; Ferdinand P. Poudeu Poudeu; Guijun Wang; John B. Wiley; Mark L. Trudell;	1	\$ 194,980
				Total	\$ 194,980
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
042CHE-08 CHE	A Multimode Scanning Probe Microscope for Effective Imaging and Characterization of Advanced Materials	University of New Orleans (Chemistry);	John B. Wiley; Bruce Gibb; Charles J. O'Connor; Kevin Stokes; Leszek Malkinski; Matt Tarr; Weilie Zhou;	1	\$ 182,547
				Total	\$ 182,547

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

043CHE-08 CHE	Thermal Analysis System for Materials Characterization at the University of New Orleans	University of New Orleans (Chemistry);	John B. Wiley; Bruce C. Gibb; Charles J. O'Connor; Matt Tarr; Ray L. Sweany;	1	\$ 167,160
				Total	\$ 167,160

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Chemistry for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
43	\$ 5,081,765	\$ 5,081,765	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2007-08

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 _____ 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 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 15 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.3 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.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? 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.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty 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?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

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 2007-08
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 _____ | 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 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | 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.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? 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.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty 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? |

No Points Given,
But this is a required
component

B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

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:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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: _____