

**LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND TRADITIONAL
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FY 2007-08**

PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE EDUCATION DISCIPLINE

INTRODUCTION

An education review panel consisting of Drs. Kathleen M. Brown (Chair), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Martha A. Adler, University of Michigan-Dearborn, met on February 7-8, 2008 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to review proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents Support Fund Enhancement Program.

Prior to the review, panel members were sent the following materials:

- Eighteen (18) Education Enhancement proposals submitted to the Board of Regents;
- A summary list of Education Enhancement proposals to be reviewed;
- The Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP) for FY 2007-08;
- The final panel's report for the FY 2005-06 Education Enhancement competition; and
- Rating forms appropriate to each of the submitted proposals.

Panel members received and studied all materials prior to the meeting. During the review process each proposal was analyzed and discussed by the two reviewers. In each case, unanimous agreement was reached following a thorough and fair evaluation of each proposal, based on the criteria established in the FY 2007-08 RFP.

The eighteen (18) Education Enhancement proposals submitted in the FY 2007-08 competition requested a total of \$2,107,776 in first-year funds. Panelists determined that there were six (6) proposals qualified to receive funding and recommended a total expenditure of \$460,194 in first-year funds. In those cases in which partial funding was recommended, that determination was made after a careful review of each proposal's budget and determination of an award amount to meet the project's urgent needs.

Table I contains rankings and established monetary recommendations of the six (6) proposals highly recommended for funding. Table II contains a listing of the two (2) proposals recommended for funding should additional funds become available, and Table III contains a listing of the ten (10) proposals not recommended for funding. Detailed reviews of all proposals follow immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations are attached at the end of the report as Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This year the panel decided that the submitted proposals were of sufficient quality to warrant the expenditure of the full amount of money available to proposals submitted in the Education discipline of the Traditional Enhancement Program. The panel looked closely at all proposals to determine that required elements were included and appropriately described. Proposals which did not include or provided minimal evidence of attention to the required elements or to the spirit of the Education component of Traditional Enhancement were not likely, according to the RFP guidelines and scoring mechanisms, to receive funding.

As reflected in the rating forms for Traditional Enhancement proposals provided to the panel and to applicants in the RFP, proposals were expected to clearly demonstrate their attention to each of these elements and were scored, per the provided scoring matrix, to reflect their success in combining these elements into a coherent, cohesive plan to build and enhance education infrastructure. Proposals that omitted or did not fully engage these requirements were, by necessity, scored accordingly.

In addition, this year the review panel noted several errors and problems in proposal submissions that were general across institutions and substantially weakened and sometimes eliminated proposals from competition. The following headings provide information on these general problems, and should be studied by all investigators who were not recommended for funding this year and who plan to submit proposals for consideration in the next Education Enhancement competition, or any Louisiana scholar considering submission in the future.

A. Project Goals and Objectives

On Page 2 of the RFP it states that “the Board of Regents reaffirmed its commitment to the reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation and encouraged all Support Fund program applicants to consider these priorities as they develop proposals.” With this in mind, the reviewers were surprised that a number of the proposals this year did not directly, or even indirectly, address this priority. As a result, a few of the proposals were eliminated immediately because the rationale for the project did not match the Board of Regents request. Likewise, the reviewers found that a number of the proposals lacked creative, in-depth solutions to complex issues even above and beyond funding availability.

B. The Enhancement Plan

Although some proposals provided well conceived and very thorough work plans, the majority of proposals lost points in this area because they lacked sufficient detail. The reviewers were constantly seeking clarification, specifics, and particulars regarding named activities, stated objectives, and project ideas. Related to this concern was a similar lack of specifics regarding performance measures and evaluation plans. Just naming a type of survey and/or a course grade is insufficient to adequately judge the degree to which a project has (or has not) achieved its goals. Within this same section, most of the proposals did not provide sufficient evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence at the regional, national, or international level.

C. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

The reviewers found this section difficult to rate. Every proposal could have done a better job of building relationships with industrial and institutional sponsors. Likewise, the section describing the promotion of economic development and/or cultural resources was often sparse, at best.

D. Budget and Budget Narrative

Most proposals provided a detailed budget, followed by a budget narrative that partially to fully explained every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds was requested. Where this explanation was lacking, the reviewers noted it in the Comments section of the proposal rubric. The proposals that received the most favorable rating with regard to budget were the ones that provided both effort and evidence of a commitment of matching funds from their home institution and/or private donors. The six proposals recommended for funding this year indicated additional funding sources from 14% to 69% (average of 37%) of the total request. From the perspective of the reviewers, these pledges indicated good faith on the part of the applicants and their respective institutions.

2007-08 Enhancement Proposals in Education

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	90	009EDS-08	McNeese	\$55,965	\$55,965	\$0	\$0
2	88	015EDS-08	ULL	\$47,735	\$42,985	\$47,735	\$42,985
3	86	014EDS-08	Tulane	\$284,410	\$137,964	\$48,822	\$0
4	84	013EDS-08	SLU	\$134,941	\$112,788		
5	80	006EDS-08	LaTech	\$64,297	\$51,464		
6	79	001EDS-08	CEN	\$59,028	\$59,028		
TOTALS:				\$646,376	\$460,194	\$96,557	\$42,985

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
7	78	010EDS-08	McNeese	\$72,933	\$72,933		
8	75	011EDS-08	McNeese	\$204,359	\$113,392		
TOTALS:				\$277,292	\$186,325	\$0	\$0

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
9	69	008EDS-08	LaTech	\$171,379	\$0		
10	67	012EDS-08	SLU	\$78,269	\$0		
11	66	016EDS-08	ULM	\$191,488	\$0		
12	65	004EDS-08	LaTech	\$25,599	\$0		
13	63	017EDS-08	ULM	\$168,593	\$0		
14	62	002EDS-08	LSUBR	\$53,116	\$0		
15	61	005EDS-08	LaTech	\$8,400	\$0	\$8,400	\$0
16	60	003EDS-08	LSUHSC-NO	\$251,600	\$0		
16	60	007EDS-08	LaTech	\$87,212	\$0	\$53,398	\$0
18	59	018EDS-08	ULM	\$148,452	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$1,184,108	\$0	\$61,798	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Teacher Education and K-12 Learning Through Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Prickett

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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 79 (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 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$59,028
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,028

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

This proposal seeks to provide pre-service teachers, interns, and practicing PK-12 teachers with up-to-date and cutting-edge technology hardware and software with which to practice, develop, and implement both PK-12 and professional development activities. The panel supports the idea of increased technological literacy in educating teacher candidates. Although faculty expertise and the proposal's impact on curriculum and instruction are strengths, the panel did wonder about the capacity of tech support within the Department of Education, as well as how the technology will actually be integrated into other courses and projects. The work plan lacked important details, such as which personnel is directly responsible for each activity as well as benchmarks and expected outcomes. For example, implementation of the primary activity will take place during August 2008-May 2009. However, it is unclear as to who will be directly responsible, what the specific outcomes will be and how they will evaluate the effectiveness of ties activity. The data with regard to the number of program graduates who enter Louisiana schools are very convincing of the potential for the impact of this project if it is successful. The section on economic impact, like others, lacks specific details (e.g., types of professional development workshops - who? how? when? where? why? what?). Despite these deficiencies, the budget appears reasonable and the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002EDS-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: University College Technology Upgrade for Improved
Communication and Student Retention

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carolyn C. Collins

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No
 A.2 4 (of 5 points)
 A.3 1 (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 1 (of 2 points)
 E.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b 10 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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 No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$53,116
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to address concerns about the recruitment and retention of in-state qualified students. This is clearly an admirable goal, and the fact that the current student-to-counselor ratio is not favorable for reaching students on a personal level is a concern that should be addressed. However, the project targets all students and is not particularly tied to teacher education, which is the intended focus of this competition. Furthermore, the solution proposed is not convincing. There is an underlying assumption to this plan that if you flood students with electronic messages in areas where they gather, they will be more likely to seek advice, subsequently do better in classes and stay in school, yet there is no evidence presented that this strategy will accomplish this. It seems that even with such an "alert" system in place, students would still need one-on-one advising, which should therefore be the project's main focus. It is also stated that counselors will be able to see more students because of improved technology, but there is no discussion of how this scenario will work. It is unclear, for example, how tracking the numbers of students participating in advising will improve recruitment and retention. The statement that the "technology influx will. . .improve the GPA of students" (p. 6) seems a huge leap of faith that is not justified in the proposal. While the listed awards received in the past are commendable, it is unclear as to how these relate to the specific goals stated in this grant. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Academy for the Advancement of Educational
Scholarship at Louisiana State University Health Sciences
Center-New Orleans (The Academy)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheila W. Chauvin

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$251,600
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to fund educational enhancement activities in order to promote scholarly work of the university's health professionals. Unfortunately, this proposal does not meet the guidelines of this grant program, which is intended for K-12 teacher education programs. It is recommended that the applicant reapply for the grant when Health and Medical Sciences is an eligible discipline. Furthermore, the panel had several concerns about this proposal. The work plan is thorough and detailed, but some elements are missing. For example, there are no benchmarks. It is indicated that the principal investigators will ask for proposals, but no indication is given of how many they expect or how they will decide what warrants the minimal and/or maximal funding amount. The proposal indicates that because of Hurricane Katrina, faculty have not had the time to focus on research projects because of the need to be teaching, but it is not clear how the award will make a difference. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Research Capability and Productivity
Related to Life-Style and Health

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charles F. Cicciarella

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 65 (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 13 (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 5 (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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$25,599
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks to improve scholarship and student involvement in primary research in the area of lifestyle and health, a division of the Education Department. This is an admirable goal, given the identified need for students to have a better understanding of how lifestyles impact the quality of health. However, there are areas that have not been addressed adequately in this proposal. For example, it is not clearly stated how the Lifestyle and Health courses are directly related to teacher education or if the students in these courses will eventually work in PK-12 settings. The actual description of course development is very minimal. The benchmarks provided are more task rather than goal-oriented (e.g., completion of syllabi, list of projects). In addition, it is not clear how evaluation of course effectiveness will be determined based on criteria such as student grades. In the section concerning evidence of potential, the proposal states that the department will gain national recognition through its new area of research and coordinated efforts with a range of agencies. However, it would be stronger if more explicit examples of how this potential will be realized were provided. The authors cite the "Framingham Heart Study" but do not tie it directly to their project. It is stated that "training of personnel is not part of this project" (p. 11) yet line item F in the budget proposes \$18,975.94 for personnel training. This needs to be clarified. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Support of Student Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charles F. Cicciarella

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 61 (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>\$8,400</u>	<u>\$8,400</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to improve student productivity in the Health and Exercise Sciences Department. Engaging undergraduate and graduate students in research is a valuable learning tool. However, as this proposal is written, there are many areas that need clarification. While it is admirable for students to be able to present at major conferences, there is no discussion of local opportunities and whether or not these are also viable (e.g., state chapters of professional organizations are typically less costly and offer student rates). It is not clear why the current equipment, such as the "large-format printer", is under-utilized. In addition, there are no benchmarks or evaluation. Personnel are not described in any detail. The project is designed to distribute funds to students, yet it is not clear who will develop the criteria for student requests for funding or who will make award decisions. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SHARE (Strengthening Health through Age-appropriate
Resources and Education) Library

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tammy Harpel

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 80 (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 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$64,297
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$51,464

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

This proposal seeks to fund the development of a curriculum resource library housing instructional materials, resources, and equipment focusing on the seven content areas of school health. This is a strong proposal that is clearly written and attentive to important details (with the exception of specific equipment pieces, video titles, and curriculum packages; identification of these materials is stated as part of the project). Making this library available to area PK-12 teachers is very commendable. The panel was concerned that the proposal mentions service learning projects often but does not describe actual activities. Given the high volume of use for their library, it is unclear how the principal investigators will assure that the library is maintained. It is not clear how the public use of the library will be managed and by whom. An assigned person such as a "librarian" is not described in the narrative but is listed in the budget narrative. The panel does not recommend funding for the instructional equipment and curriculum packages, and recommends reducing funds for instructional materials by 1/3. The panel feels strongly that a lot of these materials could be acquired as free samples from different publishing companies. Partial funding of \$51,464 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mathematics Methods and Practicum Immersion Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Julie A. Holmes

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 20 points)
 B.3 5 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 60 (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> \$87,212 </u>	<u> \$53,398 </u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$0 </u>	<u> \$0 </u>

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

This proposal seeks funds to impact the achievement gap in mathematics for elementary students through a mentoring and instructional program. This is an admirable project and focused on a very critical need. However, the presentation in this proposal does not adequately support the request. The section regarding economic impact is too generic and not sufficiently specific to the situation. It implies that "first-hand knowledge of mathematics education at the local level" is lacking. Since the authors have identified a specific school that they plan to work with and plan to place a considerable amount of effort into the school, it is unclear what is meant by "first-hand knowledge." In the project goals and objectives, some terminology needs clarification. The authors indicate in a previous section that the focus is on 3rd and 5th grades. However, in this section they indicate that the focus is "elementary/middle grades", which implies grades beyond 5th. In addition, there is a lack of measurable objectives listed. For example, "provide more closely coordinated experiences" is too general and subject to different interpretations. Also, the evaluation of this item lacks specificity. A survey of faculty collects perceptions rather than facts. There is some concern that the work plan seems top down and it is unclear how the authors will assure that the local school will be on board with this project. This is especially important since it is expected that the teachers will be required to attend workshops. It would help if there was some indication of support for participating teachers from the local school administration. The proposal indicates that at the end of the year the authors will have "focus group discussion of the project." It is not clear that this will be a valid means of evaluating the project. Also, more specific information about the faculty that relates directly to the proposed project is needed. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Literacy/Technology Model Classroom

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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:** \$151,975
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$0

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

This proposal seeks funds to incorporate technology experiences into literacy teacher education coursework. The emphasis on literacy is critical and directly addresses State needs. The proposal also focuses on critical aspects of literacy that should be part of the skill set of all K-3 educators and cites key reports to support the request. However, the proposal needs to make the link between the materials to be purchased and project goals more explicit. The goal of establishing a literacy/technology model classroom is admirable, but it is unclear how the specific technology materials will support the goals as described. Though the project objectives are those that one would expect of a teacher education literacy course, there is no discussion of why the addition of the print/electronic materials included in the budget narrative would improve the quality of instruction and/or learning. The panel is not sure whether these materials will supplant or enhance what is currently being used in coursework or how these materials will improve the quality of knowledge and skills their students obtain. Being able to plan for and implement a guided reading lesson does not depend on technology for successful implementation. The description of each of the courses is very minimal and it is unclear how "class projects" listed in each of the courses depend on the requested materials. While the core faculty have the requisite knowledge and experience, there is no discussion of who will be responsible for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of the materials to be purchased. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009EDS-08

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Promethean Activclassroom: Integration for Improving
Candidate Academic Performance

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon VanMetre

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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score: 90 (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>\$55,965</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$55,965</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, which seeks funds to provide professional development for faculty by integrating Promethean's multi-dimensional Activclassrooms, is very impressive in its thoroughness and clarity. This truly does enhance some good work the authors have already done in this area. The matching funds are excellent. However, the rationale seemed to be very generic and not specific to the authors' situation. Certain aspects of the work plan could be clarified with more details regarding the actual trainings. Also, it is not clear how each work plan activity will be evaluated. The proposal does not describe the "H.E.A.T." instrument, only what it assesses, and the panel is unfamiliar with this item. It is unclear what the principal investigators will be looking for and what the specific criteria used will be. The description of faculty development lacks details. Also, it is unclear who will actually maintain the equipment or if a preliminary agreement has already been established. Despite these minor criticisms, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010EDS-08

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Importance of Printmaking and New Technologies for Art Educators

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Schuh

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

H. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 8 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (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 _____ No _____ x _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$72,933
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,933

(if additional funding becomes available)

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

This proposal seeks funds to enhance McNeese's programs of art education and printmaking by adding new digital technologies and complementary studio equipment. The panel supports the enhancement of art education. The equipment requested is reasonable and the description is sufficiently thorough. However, the work plan lacks necessary details, such as benchmarks and evaluation criteria. For example, during the July-October 2008 period the proposal states that the principal investigators will integrate equipment, etc., to be used. However, there is no indication of how they will determine if this integration has been effective. This is also the case for their November 2008 goal, which indicates that there will be a "Fall Graduating Student Exhibit," but no other information. It is unclear how this will serve to measure the project's progress and/or effectiveness, or what the art students will actually do. The panel recommends full funding if additional monies becomes available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011EDS-08

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Four-Pronged Approach to Teacher Preparation Reform-
Collaboration Among Teacher Educators, Graduate Students,
Inservice Teachers, and Undergraduate Future Teachers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yixin Zhang

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural

Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$204,359

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$113,392

(if additional funding becomes available)

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

This proposal seeks funds to train in-service teachers to integrate emerging technologies in their content areas to enhance student learning. The work plan is strong but has some elements that could be clarified. The evaluation seems to depend on attendance and field notes. It is not clear how attendees will be recruited. There is also no discussion of what the research question(s) might be for this project. The specific details of the learning experiences and the curriculum integration are not clear. The applicant did not complete Section C (Equipment) and claims it is not an equipment proposal and yet over \$135,000 is listed in the budget for equipment. The amount requested for equipment and software appears to be somewhat excessive, especially with no institutional match in these areas. No adequate rationale was provided for the equipment and the panel is unable to distinguish what is most essential. Therefore, the panel recommends partial funding, should additional monies become available, with a 50% (\$90,967) reduction in total equipment and software costs.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Classroom 2010 Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Jason Hancock

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (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 8 (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: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,269
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal seeks to establish a "model learning environment" for the integration of technology into math and science education. There is no doubt that technology is essential for the study and practice of math and science. However, the proposal lacks adequate detail. The general focus of the proposed goals and objectives is worthwhile, but they are listed in ways that do not lead to measurable results. To "enable" is too general and does not provide the panel with clear ideas as to what this entails. It is recommended that the applicant consider stronger verbs in place of "enable," such as "increase," which is a more specific goal. This problem is continued throughout this section (p. 6). The methods of evaluation offered are unsatisfactory. It is unclear how the report to the Board of Regents will satisfy as an evaluation. More information is required. Other evaluation mechanisms includes minutes, time sheets, and completed summaries, and the panel is unsure how these will effectively measure the project's goals. The authors state that "the methods and curriculum derived from this project will be widely disseminated at the state and national levels." However, it is unclear how this will be assured. It is also unclear how the laptops taken off site will be secured. While the faculty clearly have expertise in the area of technology, there is no indication that they have math/science backgrounds. Given the fact that the focus is on the integration of technology into the math/science program, someone should be involved with the project who is experienced in these areas as well. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project C.U.D.L.E. (Creating University Designed Learning Environments)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Camille Yates

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 84 (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 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$134,941</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$112,788</u>

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

This proposal seeks funds to provide opportunities for hands-on/interactive learning through the use of a mobile assistive technology lab, universal access computer stations, a lending library that loans assistive technology, adapted toys, videos, guides, family-friendly information, and summer training. This is a strong proposal that is also creative and inclusive, and the panel supports the enhancement of special education. The work plan is descriptive and well thought out. It does lack some detail in the section regarding the teacher and family institute and presentations at national conferences, as well as in the section regarding the actual design and dissemination of the certification program (e.g., who? what? when? where? how? why?). Likewise, the faculty professional development opportunities need a more thorough description. It is unclear to the panel how, when, and where the faculty will be trained and then model best practices. The panel recommends partial funding and feels strongly that the principal investigators should seek an institutional or other match to fund supplies (reduction of \$16,145). Also, RFP guidelines (see p. 14) only allow partial salary support not to exceed 25% (reduction of \$6,008).

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014EDS-08

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Embedding Technology Throughout the Teacher Education Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Margaret Dermody

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (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 8 (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.)

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$284,410</u>	<u>\$48,822</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$137,964</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks funds to create a state-of-the-art technology lab for students working on certification, as well as provide a catalyst for developing needed training for K-12 schools in the New Orleans area in the effective implementation of teaching with technology. This is a strong proposal, but some improvements need to be made, particularly with regard to the Technology Coordinator. It appears that the success of the project is dependent upon the day-to-day activities, philosophy, and work habits of one unknown person. How will this crucial position be sustained beyond the life of the project? What criteria will be used to recruit and hire this person? How? When? Why? Another big concern is the lack of direct institutional matching monies. Would some in-kind buy-in from the public schools be an option (such as someone to coordinate with the schools)? The amount requested is excessive for the Enhancement program, especially relative to the funds available for this competition. As a result, the panel does not recommend that the BOR fund the Technology Coordinator position. Because this is seed money to build a technology lab, the panel will leave the rest of budget reductions to the discretion of the principal investigator (reduction of \$195,268 in total). The panel recommends partial funding of \$137,964, with no funding in the second year.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015EDS-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Supporting Gifts & Talents in ALL Students: Broadening Educator Understanding to Impact Student Success

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sally M. Dobyns

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 18 (of 20 points)
 B.3 25 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$47,735</u>	<u>\$47,735</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$42,985</u>	<u>\$42,985</u>

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

The proposal seeks funds to enhance a successful professional development program for educators by adding two significant elements to its offerings: gifted and talented identification and the development of implementation plans for schools and Pupil Appraisal Teams. The panel supports the idea of identifying students with gifted potential, particularly those with diverse backgrounds or financial needs. This is a strong proposal based on solid, empirical research. However, there are some elements that need further clarification. In the work plan the timeline under Goal 1 is confusing. For example, evaluations are planned in Fall 2007 before the actual implementation of the institute. It is admirable that the principal investigators plan to invite education faculty, but there are no assurances that any of them will participate; therefore, it does not serve to support impact. Invitation only does not seem adequate. More description of the faculty's (and trainers'/experts') specific experiences with the implementation of professional development institutes would have been helpful. While it concerns the panel that the quality of schools impacts residency within the community, it is not clear how this project will specifically impact this element. Funding is not recommended for catering costs, which are not allowed in the RFP (a reduction of \$5,500 over two years), and the panel feels strongly that the center can pay for printing and mailing (a reduction of \$4,000 over two years). Also, the panel recommends a change in acronyms (e.g., SWAT sends negative message versus PAL, which sends positive). Partial funding of \$42,985 is recommended in both year one and year two.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016EDS-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Breaking Barriers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran

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 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b 4 (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 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12 (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 6 (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: \$191,488
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funds to support a program that will provide technology for student learning. The fact that the authors will coordinate with Region VII is commendable. However, details that would strengthen this proposal are lacking. The stated goals are very general. While the creation of lesson plans that incorporate technology is a good objective, the focus is primarily on lesson plan development. It is recommended that the authors think about ways in addition to lesson plans that would lead to deeper understandings of the appropriateness and applicability of incorporating technology into teaching. There is no indication of technology being used within specific content areas. It is unclear how project activities will be evaluated and by whom. The authors indicate that in July 2008 they will create resources and materials. However, it is not indicated who will carry out this activity, nor the criteria used to establish this goal (p. 8). The section regarding faculty is very minimal and does not provide sufficient information to make a determination of faculty/staff expertise. In addition, since the Region VII Center is to play an integral part in this grant, it would be helpful to have a description of the Center's staff expertise and the role that they will play. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017EDS-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Portfolios

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 63 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (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: \$168,593
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal seeks funds to develop a professional portfolio system for students. The panel feels it is important for future educators to be able to represent their body of work for both scholarship as well as professional purposes. The panel also recognizes that the university seeks to achieve this goal to allow students to be competitive with other university graduates. However, important elements in the work plan are not defined, such as who will be responsible for each activity and what evaluation will be carried out. It is not clear who will create the list of requirements or how the principal investigators will know if the list is complete. In addition, when assessment is discussed it is very general, e.g., they will "keep track of meeting and workshop logs" (pp. 8-9). How will this assist in evaluating project outcomes? In the section regarding evidence of potential it is not clear how laptops will assist supervisors. Is the panel to assume that they do not have access to computer technology, or is it to be inferred that having a laptop in the field will be effective? This needs more clarification. Description of the faculty does not provide the necessary information to determine expertise in the areas being proposed. It is clear that the faculty have expertise in the area of technology, but given the fact that the objectives of the proposal are on lesson planning and implementation, it would be helpful if faculty expertise in the area of curriculum were also described. Also, it is not clear how the "Digital Portfolio" will promote economic resources as stated and lead to the opening up of opportunities for children with special needs. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018EDS-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Reading Enhancement Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran

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 3 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 59 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$148,452
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funds to enhance the preparation of teachers in reading comprehension by integrating technology into the teaching of reading strategies. Clearly this is an area that deserves attention. However, the section concerning rationale is very generic and not specific to the university. It is not clear from this discussion how the existing resources will be impacted. For "goals" a range of strategies is listed, but it is unclear how these fit into the specific project. These are all strategies that should already be covered in reading methods courses. It is unclear how any of them are related to technology. The panel recognizes that Inspiration or Kidspiration can be used to teach mapping as a graphic organizer, but they are not essential tools for teaching reading strategies. In the section concerning impact on quality of students the proposal mentions software but does not specifically address the software to be purchased and how the programs were chosen. This is especially important because there are so many different programs available on the market today. The work plan is missing critical information such as the personnel responsible for each element and a plan for benchmarks and evaluation. Also, there is a question as to how faculty will be trained to implement the project with their pre-service students. It appears that one faculty member is experienced in technology and another in teaching reading, but the proposal would be stronger if there was discussion of how they plan to work together. In addition, there is a third person mentioned, for whom there is no vitae attached. No funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001EDS-08 EDS	Enhancing Teacher Education and K-12 Learning Through Technology	Centenary College (Education);	Robert Prickett; Karen Soul;	1	\$ 59,028
				Total	\$ 59,028
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002EDS-08 EDS	University College Technology Upgrade for Improved Communication and Student Retention	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (University College);	Carolyn C. Collins; Troy Robertson;	1	\$ 53,116
				Total	\$ 53,116
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
003EDS-08 EDS	Enhancing the Academy for the Advancement of Educational Scholarship at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center- New Orleans (The Academy)	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans (Office of Medical Education Research and Development);	Sheila W. Chauvin; Jack Scott; Tong Yang;	1	\$ 251,600
				Total	\$ 251,600
N	Proposal is a New Request				
004EDS-08 EDS	Enhancement of Research Capability and Productivity Related to Life-Style and Health	Louisiana Tech University (Health and Exercise Sciences);	Charles F. Ciciarella;	1	\$ 25,599
				Total	\$ 25,599
N	Proposal is a New Request				
005EDS-08 EDS	Support of Student Research	Louisiana Tech University (Health and Exercise Sciences);	Charles F. Ciciarella;	1 2	\$ 8,400 \$ 8,400
				Total	\$ 16,800
N	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006EDS-08 EDS	SHARE (Strengthening Health Through Age-appropriate Resources and Education) Library	Louisiana Tech University (Human Ecology);	Tammy Harpel; Anita Pumphrey; Lori Myers;	1	\$ 64,297
				Total	\$ 64,297
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
007EDS-08 EDS	Mathematics Methods and Practicum Immersion Project	Louisiana Tech University (Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership);	Julie A. Holmes; Eric J. Heinrich;	1 2	\$ 87,212 \$ 53,398*
				Total	\$ 140,610
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
008EDS-08 EDS	Literacy/Technology Model Classroom	Louisiana Tech University (Curriculum, Instruction and Leadership);	Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez; Amy Vessel; Carrice Cummins; Janis Hill;	1	\$ 151,975
				Total	\$ 151,975
N					
Proposal is a New Request					

* Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009EDS-08 EDS	Promethean Activclassroom: Integration for Improving Candidate Academic Performance	McNeese State University (Educational Leadership and Instructional Technology);	Sharon VanMetre; Barbara Lewis; Delma McLeod-Porter; Gayle Pearce; Linda Larson; Wayne Fetter;	1 2 Total	\$ 55,965 \$ \$ 55,965
E	Proposal is a New Request				
010EDS-08 EDS	The Importance of Printmaking & New Technologies for Art Educators	McNeese State University (Visual Arts);	Larry Schuh; Lewis Temple;	1 Total	\$ 72,933 \$ 72,933
E	Proposal is a New Request				
011EDS-08 EDS	A Four-Pronged Approach to Teacher Preparation Reform - Collaboration Among Teacher Educators, Graduate Students, Inservice Teachers, and Undergraduate Future Teachers	McNeese State University (Educational Leadership and Instructional Technology);	Yixin Zhang;	1 Total	\$ 204,359 \$ 204,359
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012EDS-08 EDS	Classroom 2010 Project	Southeastern Louisiana University (Educational Leadership & Technology);	Robert Jason Hancock; Becky Sue Parton;	1	\$ 78,269
				Total	\$ 78,269
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
013EDS-08 EDS	Project C.U.D.L.E. (Creating Universally Designed Learning Environments)	Southeastern Louisiana University (Teaching and Learning);	Camille Yates; Colleen Klein - Ezell;	1	\$ 134,941
				Total	\$ 134,941
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
014EDS-08 EDS	Embedding Technology Throughout the Teacher Education Program	Tulane University (Teacher Preparation & Certification);	Margaret Dermody;	1 2	\$ 284,410 \$ 48,822
				Total	\$ 333,232
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015EDS-08 EDS	Supporting Gifts & Talents in ALL Students: Broadening Educator Understanding to Impact Student Success	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Gifted Education);	Sally M. Dobyns; Christine J. Briggs;	1 2 Total	\$ 47,735 \$ 47,735 \$ 95,470
N Proposal is a New Request					
016EDS-08 EDS	Breaking Barriers	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Curriculum and Instruction);	Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran; Glenda Holland;	1 Total	\$ 191,488 \$ 191,488
E Proposal is a New Request					
017EDS-08 EDS	Digital Portfolios	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Curriculum and Instruction);	Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran; Beverly Flowers-Gibson;	1 Total	\$ 168,593 \$ 168,593
E Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018EDS-08 EDS	Reading Enhancement Technology	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Curriculum and Instruction);	Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran; Beth Ricks;	1	\$ 148,452
				Total	\$ 148,452

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Education Enhancement 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
18	\$2,107,776	\$2,266,131	

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?

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: _____