

FY 2006-07 LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT - ENGINEERING A

Introduction

An Engineering A Review Panel consisting of Dr. David Ferry, Arizona State University (Electrical Engineering) [chair]; Dr. Lorraine Fleming, Howard University (Civil Engineering); and Dr. Richard Seagrave, Iowa State University (Chemical Engineering) met March 12-13, 2007 in Baton Rouge to evaluate forty-nine (49) Traditional Engineering Enhancement proposals and two (2) Undergraduate Enhancement proposals that requested monies to conduct projects that would enhance their departments or units through the Board of Regents' Support Fund (BoRSF). The 49 Traditional Engineering Enhancement proposals requested a total of \$5,600,545 in first-year funds.

Table I contains a rank-ordered list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available are listed in Table II, also in rank order. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables, and a summary of all proposals submitted and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations are attached as Appendix A and B, respectively.

Each reviewer read all fifty-one (51) proposals prior to arrival in Baton Rouge, and each person was prepared for a detailed review and presentation of the proposals at the meeting. The panel discussed each proposal in detail, which resulted in comments, suggestions, and sometimes debate about the various aspects of the proposal, vis-à-vis the three reviewers' distinct backgrounds and fields. In each case, unanimous agreement was reached with respect to each proposal's rank and funding level. The panel felt that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based upon the criteria enumerated in Appendix B.

It should be noted that the two Undergraduate Enhancement proposals' rankings and funding recommendations are contained in the Undergraduate Enhancement Program's final report. The (Engineering A) report ranks only the Engineering A proposals submitted in the Traditional Enhancement Program.

Sixteen (16) of the nineteen (19) proposals in Table I (all of which received a score of 82 or above) were recommended for the full funding requested, and the remaining three (3) proposals were recommended for partial funding because of the limitation of funds. The reductions recommended for the latter proposals were based upon thorough review of the budgets, resulting in a funding amount corresponding to the most pressing needs and merits of the proposals, as evaluated by the panel. The twenty (20) proposals in Table II were recommended for full funding if additional monies become available. The ten (10) proposals in Table III were not recommended for funding, although the overall high quality of the proposals submitted this year make the cut-off point between Tables II and III rather high. This year, as in the FY 2004 competition, since there were a very large number of outstanding proposals and no really poor proposals, it was decided to set a cutoff score between Table II and Table III proposals at 72 and 71 points, respectively.

Panel General Comments

In each case in which funding reductions are necessary for proposals listed in Table I, the recommendation is to eliminate supplies and/or graduate assistants (GAs). In the panel's view, these should be the proper responsibility of the institution. It was the panel's deliberate decision to try to limit Support Funds recommended to equipment and other critical items, with the caveat that, in the three budgets for which reduced funding was recommended, the institution should be required to maintain its promised institutional match. In the case of proposal 049, the institution is strongly encouraged to secure additional GA money.

In almost every review in which the panel has participated, there are always a few proposals that fail to follow RFP guidelines, despite their clarity. This year one applicant deemed the 15-page limitation overly stifling. Following the RFP guidelines more stringently could have resulted in the proposal's being ranked higher.

The panel wishes to commend the institutions on the overall high quality of proposals considered this year. The breadth of innovative ideas continues to grow with the fields, and the leading proposals continue to be at the forefront. The quality of the proposals this year is on par with that of FY 2003-04, with the cutoff on Table I lower only because more proposals were funded.

Panel Recommendations to Higher Education Institutions and the Board of Regents

In some cases, despite the panel's previous cautionary comments in regard to this matter, some institutions continue to submit several proposals from the same organizational unit that request funds for complementary equipment supporting the same or nearly the same research and/or a specific discipline or sub-discipline. Since the panel lacked an institutional prioritization of relative needs, each such proposal was evaluated on its own merits. The applicants and contract administrators would be well advised to note the RFP statement requiring such a prioritization, if for no other reason than to have the PIs cognizant of other colleagues' efforts. **The panel strongly recommends that the Board of Regents require institutions to provide a simple letter stating this prioritization when Enhancement proposals are submitted.**

This panel recommends that the Board continue to support the proposal preparation process—particularly at small, primarily minority institutions and through holding grantsmanship workshops as well as other means, to encourage faculty to write, edit, have someone else read, and then rewrite and submit successful proposals. This year as in previous years, there were many wonderful ideas in this group of proposals that failed to be funded because of (1) the manner in which the proposal was written, or (2) how ideas were communicated. Faculty who intend to submit Enhancement proposals are strongly encouraged to allow sufficient time to construct them carefully, following BoR guidelines, and then having someone, even a layman, read the proposal to promote clarity and eliminate possible ambiguities.

TABLE I

ENGINEERING A

PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	89.7	019ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$79,787	\$79,787
2	88.7	017ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$143,570	\$143,570
3	86	037ENGA-07	UL L	\$80,092	\$80,092
4	85.3	002ENGA-07	LSUAG	\$77,338	\$77,338
5	84.7	025ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$67,000	\$67,000
6	84.3	010ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$134,686	\$134,686
6	84.3	049ENGA-07	UNO	\$270,734	\$229,009
8	84	009ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$135,000	\$135,000
9	83.7	003ENGA-07	LSUAG	\$170,000	\$170,000
9	83.7	023ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$69,000	\$69,000
11	83.3	035ENGA-07	TULANE	\$154,842	\$154,842
12	83	013ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$204,432	\$175,690
12	83	015ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$200,000	\$170,000
12	83	018ENGA-07	LSU-S	\$23,380	\$23,380
15	82.7	024ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$70,239	\$70,239
16	82.3	026ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$45,454	\$45,454
16	82.3	032ENGA-07	NICHOLLS	\$172,799	\$172,799
16	82.3	046ENGA-07	UL L	\$99,642	\$99,642
19	82	031ENGA-07	McNEESE	\$84,634	\$84,634
TOTAL				\$2,282,629	\$2,182,162

TABLE II

ENGINEERING A

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

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
20	80	022ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$92,562	\$92,562
21	79.7	012ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$238,525	\$238,525
22	77.7	038ENGA-07	UL L	\$80,352	\$80,352
23	77.3	040ENGA-07	UL L	\$155,250	\$155,250
24	76.7	028ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$59,500	\$59,500
25	76.3	029ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$52,123	\$52,123
25	76.3	041ENGA-07	UL L	\$86,940	\$86,940
27	76	020ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$84,254	\$84,254
27	76	044ENGA-07	UL L	\$72,000	\$72,000
29	75.7	001ENGA-07	DILLARD	\$112,396	\$112,396
29	75.7	016ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$79,775	\$79,775
31	74.7	011ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$227,000	\$227,000
32	74.3	007ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$153,495	\$153,495
33	74	030ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$116,960	\$116,960
34	73.7	004ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$180,000	\$180,000
34	73.7	042ENGA-07	UL L	\$60,000	\$60,000
36	73	048ENGA-07	UNO	\$184,674	\$184,674
36	73	005ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$170,000	\$170,000
36	73	039ENGA-07	UL L	\$59,788	\$59,788
39	72.3	021ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$55,885	\$55,885
TOTAL				\$2,321,479	\$2,321,479

TABLE III

ENGINEERING A

PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
40	71	036ENGA-07	UL L	\$90,420	\$0
41	70.7	006ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$112,455	\$0
41	70.7	034ENGA-07	SU-BR	\$58,097	\$0
43	70.3	043ENGA-07	UL L	\$131,800	\$0
44	69.3	008ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$49,800	\$0
45	68.7	027ENGA-07	LA TECH	\$126,013	\$0
45	68.7	045ENGA-07	UL L	\$180,000	\$0
47	65.3	033ENGA-07	SU-BR	\$79,639	\$0
48	63.7	047ENGA-07	UNO	\$58,794	\$0
49	60	014ENGA-07	LSU-BR	\$109,419	\$0
TOTAL				\$996,437	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Abdalla Darwish

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Engineering Program at Dillard University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.3 (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 7.6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (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 2.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

75.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,396

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$112,396
(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.)

Dillard University's effort would have a significant impact on a large number of courses, but will benefit few students. The proposal was poorly organized and did not follow BoR guidelines. The justification for purchasing the expensive laser system is inadequate, and the performance measures are not stated. The proposal would have benefited from careful review before submission and better use of the grammar-checker function of a word processing program. The PIs' previous awards derive from BoR sources only. Despite the institutional cash match pledged, the panel recommends full funding only if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002ENGA-07

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 X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.7 (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 2.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

85.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$77,338

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$77,338

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 existing program is strong and has good economic justification. The project addresses an important problem that will, in all likelihood, have an impact beyond Louisiana, and the team is excellent. Nevertheless, the proposal would have benefited from additional evidence of the economic feasibility of this approach on the large scale. How will the new equipment increase the status of the departments and create economic growth? The proposal would also have benefited from the pledge of matching funds. Full funding is recommended despite these minor concerns.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Qinglin Wu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Profile Extrusion Facility for Fiber-Reinforced Thermoplastic Composite Research and Development

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (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 8.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 15.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.7 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$170,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$170,000

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 good proposal with a well-documented justification and a recommendation of full funding. The applicants seek to purchase a single major piece of equipment. However, its goals and objectives tended to be broad, and the PIs did not specifically describe how the equipment to be acquired would have an impact on the program. The budget would have benefited from more matching funds and a better description of the possible external funding sources. However, if the equipment performs as described in the proposal, it should certainly be possible to obtain some external funds in the future.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pratul K. Ajmera

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Plasma Source for Low Temperature
Deposition of Carbon Nanotubes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No X
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (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 0.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 73.7 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 12 (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 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: \$180,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$180,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

The PIs propose an expensive investment in a very competitive area that has not yet found a niche in Louisiana. However, a proposal of this nature needs some description of the status of the entire field of CNT research on the LSU campus at the present time, and how that factor will impact education across the curriculum. Additionally, the budget would have benefited from a larger industrial and/or foundation support and a hard institutional match. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Steve C.S. Cai

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of a Field Monitoring and Performance
Evaluation System for Civil Infrastructures

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.3 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 7.3 (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 2.7 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14.3 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1.7 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1.7 (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: \$170,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$170,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

Numerous LSU PIs describe the benefits of acquisition of a system for embedding sensors in new bridges, but for the panel, the key is rehabilitation of older bridges. The proposal's development plan and objectives are quite vague; its plan may be premature since it is unclear to the panel that this approach will work. The panel is also unclear regarding how the proposed project will impact the current Civil and Environmental Engineering Department. The project also lacks significant institutional matching commitment other than some faculty salaries and fringe benefits. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jost Goettert

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Electronic Post Processing Equipment for Micro and Nano
Technology

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 5.3 (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 70.7 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10.7 (of 15 points)
 B.3 11.3 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4.3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (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: \$112,455
 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 CAMD effort appears to be one of infrastructure support and/or maintenance, which the panel feels should be part of the regular institutional budget. Most of the PIs are technical support staff members; therefore, the panel is concerned as to how the project will promote eminence. Additionally, the proposal should have contained evidence of industrial partnering and a significant (hard) institutional match. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yoonyoung Jin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Thin-Film and Surface Process Capabilities at the CAMD Cleanroom

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 2.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (of 6 points)
C.2 0.7 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 10.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.3 (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 10.3 (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 _____

H. Total Score:

74.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$153,495

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$153,495

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is another CAMD program that would benefit an interdisciplinary faculty group. The panel's primary concerns are how this project will impact CAMD's overarching goals as well as departmental goals and growth. Since these PIs received BoR funding during the previous cycle, panel members were anxious to know what progress had been made and were disappointed when we found little discussion of progress. Despite few answers to panel concerns, full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: F. Carl Knopf

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating a Cogeneration Facility into Engineering Education - Emissions Monitoring

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No X
 A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (of 6 points)
 C.2 0.3 (of 1 point)
 C.3 1 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 5.7 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 69.3 (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 10.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1.3 (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 1.7 (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: \$49,800
 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 appears to be a wonderful opportunity for educational enhancement with potentially beneficial economic consequences for LSU. However, the development plan is extraordinarily weak because the various parts of the program are not well connected and the responsibilities not well defined. While the panel agrees that the proposed project will impact the curriculum, it is unclear how that impact will stimulate respect for the curriculum. The impact on faculty and students is not discussed adequately. The issues with regard to partnering and economic growth appear to have been ignored, and there is no institutional commitment. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David M. Koppelman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Multiple Microarchitecture, Single Instruction Set Architecture Multiprocessor System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 15.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$135,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$135,000

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 program has clear potential for both research and teaching, and the institution has made a significant contribution to it. While its economic impact may be small at present, it has great future potential. However, the proposal would have benefited from a better discussion of this point. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Challa S. Kumar

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Analytical Equipment for In-situ Monitoring of Reactions
During Microfluidic Synthesis of Nanomaterials

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

84.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.6 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.7 (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: \$134,686

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$134,686

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 benefited from incorporating the results of nanoparticle synthesis that provided a dependable quality control for large-scale syntheses into pre-college, college, and post-graduate education. The proposal is a good one overall, but would have benefited from better discussion of complementary activities and how these would improve economic development. It could also have benefited from a (hard) cost-sharing commitment to demonstrate its importance to the Center. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yaroslav Losovyj

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Nanophase Materials Characterization System at 3m NIM Beamline at CAMD

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes No X
A.2 3.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

74.7

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.7 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$227,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$227,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

This LSU CAMD proposal indicates significant interdisciplinary and inter-institutional effort. However, there is little significant cost sharing for this expensive project. Moreover, the Omicron head does not include a chamber (according to the bid), and discussion of how this head will be incorporated into the current system and its cost is inadequate. Since the PIs are primarily technical staff, the manner in which this effort will yield institutional eminence is unclear. Despite these doubts, the panel recommends full funding for this proposal if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ayman M. Okeil

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading LSU Structural Materials and Systems Lab to Meet 21st Century Challenges

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (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 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 13.6 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

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 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

79.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$238,525

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$238,525

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal requests a straightforward equipment upgrade that will have significant curricular impact. It profits from few weaknesses and boasts several strengths. However, it would have benefited if it had much more substantial institutional cost-sharing match other than salaries, fringe, and overhead. The panel recommends full funding for this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sungook Park

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Nanoscale Surface Characterization Capabilities for Multidisciplinary Researches

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 13.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 15.6 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$204,432

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$175,690

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 good interdisciplinary application that clearly explains how the central piece of equipment will be used in the various projects described. The equipment is the right one for the projects, and the applicants do a good job of explaining the contributions to economic development in Louisiana. The proposal would have benefited from a larger institutional matching commitment. The relationship between this program and CAMD should have been better explained. The panel believed that the budget should be reduced by \$28,742 through elimination of two items: the 65-0155 quick-side assembly (\$14,650) and the corresponding 78-2000 NSOM (\$14,092). Thus, the panel recommends funding of \$175,690 for the project, with the caveat that the institutional match be fully maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Romagnoli J. Alberto

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Virtual/Hybrid E-Learning Labs for Distance Education

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 2.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 2.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3.7 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.1 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 9.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 9.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.3 (of 2 points)
B.6 2.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

60

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$109,419

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 did not follow BoR guidelines. Some sections were not addressed and all of them were not marked, making it difficult for the panel to follow the discussion. The connection between the requested equipment and the program goals was unclear. The equipment request might have been better if it were not bundled, as the whole was less than the sum of its parts. This is one case in which the PIs would have benefited from collaboration with and exposure to faculty with more experience in preparing successful proposals. The panel does not recommend funding for this project as it stands.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ashok Srivastava

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Advanced Electronics Curriculum in Electrical and Computer Engineering

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3.3 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.3 (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 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$200,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$170,000

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

The panel recommends funding of \$170,000 for the project that would expand the undergraduate electronics curriculum by increasing the available equipment for VLSI circuit design. The proposal was repetitious, and the PIs could have made the plan to achieve eminence through this program clearer. The panel recommends elimination of the amount requested by \$30,000, which should come from the "supplies" line item, through reducing the number of work stations from 18 to 6. As institutional matching funds were not evident in this category, the total pledged match should remain unchanged.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jiaping Wang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a High Temperature Differential Scanning Calorimeter

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.1 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (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:

75.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$79,775

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$79,775

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is another interdisciplinary LSU program in which faculty have requested a new piece of equipment, as the title of the proposal states. The applicants provide a few good examples of the use of this equipment, but expend almost no time describing how this effort will catapult the institution into greater eminence. Nor were performance measures adequately stated. The project's economic impact is weak, and there is no institutional cost sharing in the budget. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Guoping Zhang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Ultrahigh Resolution Positioning and Dynamic Loading Functions for an Integrated Nanocharacterization and Nanomechanical Testing System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 14.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.7 (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 11.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

88.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$143,570

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$143,570

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 very novel proposal to insert nanotechnology in civil engineering. The project appears to be a change in the mission of civil engineering (which is long overdue) and is interdisciplinary in nature. However, is the department supporting the change? The proposal would have been strengthened by further evidence of support from the relevant departments. Despite this minor concern, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary R. Boucher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: EMI Monitoring System for Electronics Lab Enhancement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (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 8.3 (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 11.6 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$23,380

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$23,380

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 very well-focused proposal that should precipitate a large gain for a small cost. It is a good coupling of EMI and Autocad, which is unusual. The work plan was a little vague and did not fully explain how the new equipment will help achieve project goals. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Erez N. Allouche

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Cementitious Materials Laboratory Enhancement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.4 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.3 (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:

89.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$79,787

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$79,787

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 emanates from a group of young, strong faculty. They have put together a good proposal that will impact many courses in both civil and mechanical engineering. Nevertheless, the proposal could have been strengthened with a better discussion of how this equipment will contribute to future eminence of these departments. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kelly Crittenden

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Engineering Education Through Modern Precision Fabrication Tools

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

76

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.4 (of 15 points)
B.3 14.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$84,254

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$84,254

(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 equipment to be acquired will be used at all levels of the program's curriculum. Nevertheless, the proposal's development plan should have been more specific regarding the new options or capabilities that the proposed equipment will provide. The performance measures are vague. The budget, however, evidences a goodly amount of institutional support. The panel recommends full funding for this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dixie M. Griffin, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Fluid Mechanics/Hydraulics Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.1 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.3 (of 2 points)
B.6 2.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score:

72.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$55,885

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$55,885

(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.)

If implemented, this proposal would strengthen the academic experiences of students in Louisiana Tech's fluid mechanics/hydraulics laboratory. However, the development plan for equipment usage should have been more detailed, especially as this effort will do little to impact the Civil Engineering Department's eminence since all the equipment and software should already be standard equipment. Additionally, the project's performance measures were inadequate. Despite these concerns, the panel recommends full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Luke S. Lee

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Composite Structures 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 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (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 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$92,562

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$92,562

(if additional funds become available)

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

The project is a joint one between Louisiana Tech's Civil and Mechanical Engineering departments that will provide students with hands-on exposure to composite materials. The PIs do a good job of describing experiments that will be adjusted, but they do not directly connect these experiments to a particular course or courses. Can these experiments and their impact on the courses be developed in one quarter, as there is no release time for either PI? Is this facility unique in the country? How will it help the units achieve eminence? A good evaluation plan is lacking. Despite the lack of answers to these questions, the panel recommends full funding of this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yuri M. Lvov

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Educational and Research Infrastructure for Nanosystems Engineering and Molecular Science and Nanotechnology Curricula

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

83.7

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.6 (of 15 points)
B.3 15.6 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.7 (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: \$69,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$69,000

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.)

There is a strong connection between nano and molecular science and paper manufacturing in this program, which is very important to the economy of Louisiana. Faculty expertise is excellent. Nevertheless, the proposal could have benefited from better description of the implied association with Grambling State University. Connecting the rationale and discussion of the equipment to the specific parts of the program, as well as stating project goals more clearly, would also have benefited the effort. Performance measures were particularly weak. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniela Mainardi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Laboratory Enhancement for Nanotechnology
Education

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
D.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
D.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 17.3 (of 20 points)
B.3 18.6 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

82.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,239
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,239

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 written by a young, vigorous faculty member who will develop CAD (Materials Studio software) and nanotechnology education in Louisiana Tech's Department of Chemical Engineering. His work will provide modeling experiences for students that will also be useful to industry. The proposal could have benefited from a better discussion of how the physical and chemical insights will be incorporated in the modeling, as modeling software by itself does not *a priori* generate excellence. The panel would have expected to find significant collaboration in this program as well as contributions from industry for the software, but in spite of these omissions, recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chad B. O'Neal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Microsystems Engineering Labs with a XeF2 Release Etch Station

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (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 6.6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

84.7

 (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 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 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 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.7 (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: \$67,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$67,000

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 important project will enhance laboratory courses. However, this proposal succeeded in spite of itself. It suffered from poorly stated performance measures and the lack of a discussion of possible economic impact beyond the classroom. The addition of equipment, by itself, even coupled with course development, is not a good plan for achieving eminence and economic growth. Despite this concern, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James D. Palmer

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Chemical Engineering Laboratory with Infrared
In-Line Process Analysis

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 3.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

82.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 16.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (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 10.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.7 (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: \$45,454

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$45,454

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 expresses a good coupling of a standard processing tool with new, online capabilities for signal acquisition and analysis. The connection between the two investigators is beneficial to the project. The proposal, however, could have been strengthened by discussion of the importance of this effort, particularly regarding economic growth and its impact on teaching and learning. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sandra Selmic

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Measurement and Characterization Laboratory and Graduate Education in Non-Destructive Materials Testing Through Practical Training

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 3.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (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 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 0 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

68.7

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (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 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: \$126,013

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 Louisiana Tech University proposal has potential, but unfortunately it did not follow one of the BoR guidelines as stated in the RFP. The panel awarded no points for items beyond the 15-page limit. Even so, the proposal would have ranked higher had the development plan been more complete, including discussion of how the equipment would have impacted research and education. The panel does not recommend funding for this project. The proposal should be revamped and rewritten more concisely.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kody Varahramyan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Thermal Evaporator for Micro/Nanotechnologies Education and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.8 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.7 (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 10.3 (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:

76.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$59,500

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,500

(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.)

Replacement of an aging thermal evaporator with a modern evaporation process is the major goal of this proposal. Much of the proposed project's relationship with micro/nanotechnology education is clear, but the discussion of the equipment's impact is not well made. Likewise, the case for the promotion of institutional eminence and economic gain is weak. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding for this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jay Wang

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Geotechnical Engineering Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.8 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 13.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2.7 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

76.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$52,123

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$52,123

(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 goal of this proposal is to enhance Louisiana Tech's Geotechnical Engineering laboratory. The panel notes the institution's significant matching commitment. However, the requested equipment is basic and not likely to catapult the institution into a higher level of eminence. The performance measures were very poor, and the proposal was overly repetitive. The research group would have benefited from review of previously successful Enhancement proposals that should be available at the institution as well as for review by the general public at the BoR's offices. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding of this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Li-He Zou

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Telecommunication Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 14.5 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$116,960

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$116,960

(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 background work of defining the proposed program at Louisiana Tech and the equipment needed are fairly well stated, but the developmental plan needed additional details. The panel is unclear how upgrading a laboratory will result in growth of departmental or institutional eminence. In our experience, student surveys do not provide reliable performance measures. Nevertheless, the proposal is recommended for full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Dennison

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Infrastructure of Fundamental Electrical Engineering Laboratories

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (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 10.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$84,634

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$84,634

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.)

This is an important program for upgrading equipment that will have an impact on ten courses at McNeese State University. The proposal's rank would have been somewhat higher if items B.1 through B.3 were addressed more fully. The panel realizes that it is difficult to make the case that a basic EE laboratory will increase institutional eminence. Regardless, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Balaji Ramachandran

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Geospatial Technology Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7.5 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (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 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score:

82.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$172,799

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$172,799

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 good proposal from the New Geomatics Program faculty that has the potential to make a major impact on the training of professional surveyors and mappers, yet few institutions offer geomatics. This new training program will directly benefit GPS-related professions. In addition, the link to the Biology Department program is good. However, the applicants could have developed better the linkages between the equipment requested and the proposal's objectives. The pledge of both institutional and private matching support is commendable, and full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Riyadh Al-Raoush

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Water Resources Engineering Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 3.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (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 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 8.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.6 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.7 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

65.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$79,639

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's development plan did not describe how the equipment would fit into the plan or how the instrumentation would be used in research and educational efforts. The panel found no description of how this project would promote institutional eminence. The discussion of industrial relationships is very vague and non-specific, and cost sharing nonexistent. For these reasons the panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034ENGA-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hak-Chul Shin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Structural/Material Testing Equipments

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.7 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score:

70.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$58,097

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 PIs would have benefited greatly from reviewing previously funded BoRSF proposals, available to the public at the BoR offices, and from collaboration with or exposure to faculty who have had more experience in writing successful proposals. There are no connections between the equipment, the objectives, and the plan. In addition, much of the rhetoric in section B.3 of the proposal is almost identical to that of another SUBR proposal. The panel advises the PIs that a good proposal does not overstate its case. Funding cannot be recommended as the proposal stands now. It should be rewritten and resubmitted in another cycle.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: W. T. Godbey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Fluorescence Activated Cell Sorter (FACS)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.6 (of 15 points)
B.3 15.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0.7 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

83.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$154,842

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$154,842

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

The applicant seeks a single major research tool for the program. The faculty has clearly defined a set of projects and described how this tool will impact each of them. The proposal could have benefited from a stronger set of performance measures and a clearer schedule for project implementation; however, the panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cherif Aissi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Embedded Control System Laboratory for Undergraduate Instruction and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.3 (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 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 10.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

71

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$90,420

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.)

Upgrading the Industrial Technology control laboratory is the goal of this UL-L project. The PIs would have benefited from collaboration with the Departments of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. The development plan is vague, the performance measures very weak, and the plan to impact the departments' and institution's growth of eminence questionable. It is unclear how this equipment will accomplish the not-well-defined goals. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emad Habib

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Virtual-Reality Hydro-ecological and Engineering Observatory System for Educating Future Engineers and Scientists in the Field of Hurricane Protection and Coastal Restoration

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>4.7</u>	(of 5 points)	

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

C.1	<u>10.7</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	-------------	----------------

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

D.1	<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
D.2a	<u>7.3</u>	(For S/E)
or	<u> </u>	(of 10 points)
D.2b	<u> </u>	(For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1	<u>4.7</u>	(of 5 points)
B.2	<u>17.3</u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u>20.6</u>	(of 25 points)
B.4	<u>4.7</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
B.6	<u>4.3</u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	Yes <u>X</u>	No <u> </u>

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1	<u>2.7</u>	(of 4 points)
-----	------------	---------------

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1	Yes <u>X</u>	No <u> </u>
-----	--------------	--------------------------------

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$80,092</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$80,092</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 is an aggressive, but achievable proposal. The integration in the curriculum plan is excellent, but the discussion of who will be responsible for the integration is somewhat weak. The proposal is slightly limited in the ability to develop eminence by lack of a doctorate in civil engineering. The proposal would have benefited had a teaming plan for an effective doctorate for the students been achieved. Nevertheless, full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Renuka P. Jindal

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of RF and Noise Measurement Laboratory for Device, Circuit and System Characterization in the Multigigahertz Regime for Wireless and Lightwave Applications

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 3.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (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 6.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 77.7 (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 13.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$80,352

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$80,352

(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 proposed expansion of the RF and optical communications program at UL-L through acquisition of the critical missing piece—a system that will handle devices, circuits and subsystems—is this project's strength. As described, however, the project is fairly broad. The panel is concerned that faculty members engaged in it may be too few to achieve its objectives. Additional details relating to the development of the teaching modules were needed, and the description of how the modules would impact the curriculum should have been a necessary component of the proposal. Despite these concerns, the panel recommends full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: G. H. Massiha

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: PC Net and PLC for Logic Control and Electronics Design
Technology Laboratory (PLCnet)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.7 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 6.5 (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 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 11.7 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3.3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$59,788

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,788

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal's goal is to upgrade UL-Lafayette's Industrial Technology Control laboratory. It would have benefited from collaboration with the Departments of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. The development plan is vague, and how the plan will impact departmental and institutional progression to eminence is somewhat questionable. Nevertheless, the need for the upgrade was described, and the panel recommends full funding for this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. D. K. Misra

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Multipurpose Cyclic Tensile System to Support Polymer Science and Engineering Teaching and Research Programs

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (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 1.3 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.3 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

77.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 13.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$155,250

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$155,250

(if additional funds become available)

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

The proposed effort would benefit several departments, as polymer research is multidisciplinary in nature and several UL-L departments participate in it. However, there is little discussion of the new courses that should connect the effort. The plan appears to have few details relating to the development of the project, and the PIs do not seem able to attract significant external funding. Nevertheless, full funding of this project is recommended if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhongqi Pan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 40 Gbits/s Bit-Error-Rate Test Set for Telecommunications Program at EECE Department

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.3 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.1 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

76.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 12.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$86,940

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$86,940

(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 PIs' goal is to upgrade high-speed telecommunications test equipment. The proposal would have benefited from a more detailed discussion of the development plan. The PIs should have focused more on establishing the need for this particular equipment and how the project would promote eminence. In general, the proposal needed more specificity and fewer generalities. However, the panel recommends full funding for this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhongqi Pan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fusion Splicer for the Development of a Multidisciplinary Optical Fiber Program at UL Lafayette

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 12.6 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 1.7 (of 2 points)
B.6 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

73.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

The PIs wish to acquire one piece of equipment, a fusion splicer, which is supposed to spawn a new industry in Louisiana. However, it was unclear to the panel how the fusion splicer would benefit the telecommunications program since the goals and plan are weak and vague. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nian-Feng Tzeng

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: RFID-Based Library Management System: Localization, Data Logging, and Visualization

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4.7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 9.4 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.3 (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 2.3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

70.3

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$131,800
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 UL-L proposal is interesting, but none of the goals and objectives appears to be research-oriented. In the panel's view, this situation will not support the institution's growth toward eminence. Additionally, the project's impact on research and education programs is unclear. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hongyi Wu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Prototyping and Empirical Evaluation of Delay/Fault-Tolerant
Mobile Sensor Network (DFT-MSN)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.7 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.7 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 6.7 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10.7 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12.6 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4.3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10.3 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$72,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

This UL-L project would help students experience the design of total systems; in this case, mobile systems. The applicants should have sharpened the plan's description and its performance measures. The methods of maintaining the system are not described well, since maintaining mobile sensors is more complicated than maintenance of a computer network. The recommendation of the panel is for full funding if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 045ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark E. Zappi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishment of Biodiesel Performance Evaluation Capability

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (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 2.7 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.2 (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 7.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 10.7 (of 20 points)
B.4 3.7 (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 _____ No X

H. Total Score:

68.7

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$180,000

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's development plan was vague and nondescript. In the panel's view, the PIs would benefit significantly from collaboration with and exposure to individuals who possess more experience in writing successful proposals. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 046ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Danella Zhao

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Design of Communication-Centric Embedded System-on-Chips

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 6.6 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

82.3

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.2 12.3 (of 15 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3.3 (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: \$99,642

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$99,642

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 had an excellent abstract; however, this is another case in this review in which the proposal received a good rank in spite of itself. One of its benefits is having serious matching commitments for equipment. The evaluation and performance measures, however, were weak, and it is not entirely clear to the panel how the proposed wireless communications would be useful for on-chip communications, since most chips are their own worst EMI sources. Full funding is recommended despite these concerns of the panel.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 047ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Huimin Chen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Multimedia Based Peer Instruction Environment for Curriculum Enhancement and Distance Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 3.3 (of 5 points)
 A.3 3.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.3 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 4.7 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 63.7 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10.7 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3.7 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7.7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$58,794

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 encourages the PI of this proposal to develop approaches that are new and innovative. The panel does not recommend funding for this project as it stands since there is nothing new or innovative about it.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 048ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edit J. Kaminsky Bourgeois

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Communications and Networking Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 4.7 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5.7 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)
E.2a 5.3 (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 9.7 (of 15 points)
B.3 11.3 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4.3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (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: \$184,674

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$184,674

(if additional funds become available)

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

This UNO proposal appears to be one of recovery, not enhancement. The development plan is marginal, and more information is needed regarding how the experiments would fit into the curriculum. The proposed goals are vaguely stated, and the panel believes the institutional match inadequate for the amount of BoRSF monies requested. Regardless, the panel recommends full funding of this project if additional monies become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 049ENGA-07

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Winters-Hilt

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
 A.2 5 (of 5 points)
 A.3 4.7 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4.7 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2.3 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1.7 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 7.3 (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 84.3 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13.3 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15.6 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4.7 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4.3 (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 2.7 (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: \$270,734

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$229,009

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

This proposal is a novel idea for a new and important area that provides an innovative integration of laboratory results and bioinformatics theory. However, the connection between the nanopore detectors and the overall bioinformatics could have been clearer. Partial funding of \$229,009 is recommended by reducing the GA/Lab Techs budget by \$41,725, since it is not totally clear how critical they are to the program. If the institution chooses to reduce the pledged match correspondingly, it should be in that category only. The panel recommends, instead, that the institution increase its contribution in this line item.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Engineering A
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001 ENG A-07	Enhancement of Instruction and Research in the Engineering Program at Dillard University	Dillard University (Physics and Pre-Engineering);	Abdalla Darwish; Allan Burkett; Bernard Singleton; R. Stanton; Svetlana Aroutiounian;	1	\$ 112,396
				Total	\$ 112,396
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002 ENG A-07	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	\$ 77,338
				Total	\$ 77,338
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
003ENGA-07 ENG A	Advanced Profile Extrusion Facility for Fiber-Reinforced Thermoplastic Composite Research and Development	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Renewable Natural Resources);	Qinglin Wu; Rich Vlosky;	1	\$ 170,000
				Total	\$ 170,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
004ENGA-07 ENG A	Acquisition of a Plasma Source for Low Temperature Deposition of Carbon Nanotubes	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	Pratul K. Ajmera; Yoonyoung Jin;	1	\$ 180,000
				Total	\$ 180,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
005ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of a Field Monitoring and Performance Evaluation System for Civil Infrastructures	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Civil and Environmental Engineering);	Steve C. S. Cai; Ayman Okeil; George Voyiadjis; Guoping Zhang; Guoxiang Gu; Hak-Chul Shin; Richard Avent;	1	\$ 170,000
				Total	\$ 170,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006ENGA-07 ENG A	Electronic Post Processing Equipment for Micro and Nano Technology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures & Devices);	Jost Goettert; Alex Crappell; Min Zhang; Proyag Datta; Russell Louis; Toby Miller;	1	\$ 112,455
				Total	\$ 112,455
E	Proposal is a New Request				
007ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Thin -Film and Surface Process Capabilities at the CAMD Cleanroom	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures & Devices);	Yoonyoung Jin; Fareed Dawan; Jost Goettert; Tracy Morris;	1	\$ 153,495
				Total	\$ 153,495
E	Proposal is a New Request				
008ENGA-07 ENG A	Integrating a Cogeneration Facility into Engineering Education - Emissions Monitoring	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Chemical Engineering);	F. Carl Knopf; Kerry M. Dooley; Kevin W. Kelly;	1	\$ 49,800
				Total	\$ 49,800
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009ENGA-07 ENG A	A Multiple Microarchitecture, Single Instruction Set Architecture Multiprocessor System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	David M. Koppelman; Clive Woods; J. Ramanujam; Lu Peng;	1	\$ 135,000
				Total	\$ 135,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
010ENGA-07 ENG A	Analytical Equipment for In-situ Monitoring of Reactions During Microfluidic Synthesis of Nanomaterials	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures & Devices);	Challa S. Kumar; Carola Leuschner; Cristina Sabliov; James Spivey; Josef Hormes; Jost Goettert;	1	\$ 134,686
				Total	\$ 134,686
E	Proposal is a New Request				
011ENGA-07 ENG A	The Enhancement of Nanophase Materials Characterization System at 3m NIM Beamline at CAMD	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures & Devices);	Yaroslav Losovyj; Orhan Kizilkaya; Phillip Sprunger; Theda Daniels-Race;	1	\$ 227,000
				Total	\$ 227,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012ENGA-07 ENG A	Upgrading LSU Structural Materials and Systems Lab to Meet 21st Century Challenges	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Civil and Environmental Engineering);	Ayman M. Okeil; George Z. Voyiadjis; Hsiao-Chun Wu; R. Richard Avent; Steve C. S. Cai;	1	\$ 238,525
				Total	\$ 238,525
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
013ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Nanoscale Surface Characterization Capabilities for Multidisciplinary Researchers	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mechanical Engineering);	Sunggook Park; Bingqing Wei; Dooyoung Hah; Harris Wong; James E. Henry; Jin Woo Choi;	1	\$ 204,432
				Total	\$ 204,432
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
014ENGA-07 ENG A	Virtual/Hybrid E-Learning Labs for Distance Education	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Chemical Engineering);	Romagnoli J. Alberto; Karsten E. Thompson;	1	\$ 109,419
				Total	\$ 109,419
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Undergraduate Advanced Electronics Curriculum in Electrical and Computer Engineering	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	Ashok Srivastava; R. Clive Woods;	1	\$ 200,000
				Total	\$ 200,000
E	Proposal is a New Request				
016ENGA-07 ENG A	Acquisition of a High Temperature Differential Scanning Calorimeter	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mechanical Engineering);	Jiaping Wang; Bingqing Wei; Guoping Zhang; Wenjin Meng;	1	\$ 79,775
				Total	\$ 79,775
E	Proposal is a New Request				
017ENGA-07 ENG A	Acquisition of Ultrahigh Resolution Positioning and Dynamic Loading Functions for an Integrated Nanocharacterization and Nanomechanical Testing System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Civil & Environmental Engineering);	Guoping Zhang; Bingqing Wei; David Neau; George Z. Voyiadjis; Jiaping Wang; John R. Smith; Ray E. Ferrell;	1	\$ 143,570
				Total	\$ 143,570
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018ENGA-07 ENG A	EMI Monitoring System for Electronics Lab Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Engineering and Industrial Technology);	Gary R. Boucher;	1	\$ 23,380
				Total	\$ 23,380
E Proposal is a New Request					
019ENGA-07 ENG A	Advanced Cementitious Materials Laboratory Enhancement	Louisiana Tech University (Civil Engineering);	Erez N. Allouche; Aziz Saber; Henry Cardenas; Luke Lee; Michael E. Baumert;	1	\$ 79,787
				Total	\$ 79,787
E Proposal is a New Request					
020ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancing Engineering Education Through Modern Precision Fabrication Tools	Louisiana Tech University (Mechanical Engineering);	Kelly Crittenden;	1	\$ 84,254
				Total	\$ 84,254
E Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Undergraduate Fluid Mechanics/Hydraulics Lab	Louisiana Tech University (Civil Engineering);	Dixie M. Griffin, Jr.; Michael E. Baumert;	1	\$ 55,885
				Total	\$ 55,885
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
022ENGA-07 ENG A	Composite Structures Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Civil Engineering);	Luke S. Lee; Aziz Saber;	1	\$ 92,562
				Total	\$ 92,562
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
023ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Educational and Research Infrastructure for Nanosystems Engineering and Molecular Science and Nanotechnology Curricula	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing);	Yuri M. Lvov; John McDonald; Kody Varahramyan;	1	\$ 69,000
				Total	\$ 69,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024 ENG A	Computer Laboratory Enhancement for Nanotechnology Education	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing);	Daniela Mainardi;	1	\$ 70,239
				Total	\$ 70,239
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
025 ENG A	Enhancement of Microsystems Engineering Labs with a XeF2 Release Etch Station	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing);	Chad B. O'Neal;	1	\$ 67,000
				Total	\$ 67,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
026 ENG A	Enhancing the Chemical Engineering Laboratory with Infrared In-Line Process Analysis	Louisiana Tech University (Chemical Engineering);	James D. Palmer; Scott Gold;	1	\$ 45,454
				Total	\$ 45,454
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
027 ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of the Measurement and Characterization Laboratory and Graduate Education in Non-Destructive Materials Testing Through Practical Training	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing);	Sandra Selmic; Alfred Gunasekaran; Cheng Luo; Tabbetha Dobbins;	1	\$ 126,013
E				Total	\$ 126,013
Proposal is a New Request					
028 ENGA-07 ENG A	Thermal Evaporator for Micro/Nanotechnologies Education and Research	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing);	Kody Varahramyan; Cheng Luo; John McDonald;	1	\$ 59,500
E				Total	\$ 59,500
Proposal is a New Request					
029 ENGA-07 ENG A	Undergraduate Geotechnical Engineering Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Civil Engineering);	Jay Wang; Aziz Saber; Michael E. Baumert;	1	\$ 52,123
E				Total	\$ 52,123
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
030 ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Telecommunication Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Electrical Engineering);	Li-He Zou;	1	\$ 116,960
				Total	\$ 116,960
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
031 ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancing the Infrastructure of Fundamental Electrical Engineering Laboratories	McNeese State University (Engineering);	James Dennison; Nikos Kiritsis;	1	\$ 84,634
				Total	\$ 84,634
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
032 ENGA-07 ENG A	Development of a Geospatial Technology Lab	Nicholls State University (Applied Sciences);	Balaji Ramachandran; Terry J. Dantin;	1	\$ 172,799
				Total	\$ 172,799
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
033 ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of Water Resources Engineering Laboratory	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Civil Engineering);	Riyadh Al-Raoush; Chun-Ling Huang;	1	\$ 79,639
				Total	\$ 79,639
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
034 ENGA-07 ENG A	Acquisition of Structural/Material Testing Equipments	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Civil Engineering);	Hak-Chul Shin; Muluneh Azene;	1	\$ 58,097
				Total	\$ 58,097
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
035 ENGA-07 ENG A	Acquisition of a Fluorescence Activated Cell Sorter (FACS)	Tulane University (Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering);	W. T. Godbey;	1	\$ 154,842
				Total	\$ 154,842
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
036 ENGA-07 ENG A	An Embedded Control System Laboratory for Undergraduate Instruction and Research	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Industrial Technology);	Cherif Aissi; M. A. Elsayed;	1	\$ 90,420
				Total	\$ 90,420
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
037 ENGA-07 ENG A	Development of a Virtual-Reality Hydro-ecological and Engineering Observatory System for Educating Future Engineers and Scientists in the Field of Hurricane Protection and Coastal Restoration	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Civil Engineering);	Emad Habib; Carolina Cruz-Neira; Ehab A. Meselhe;	1	\$ 80,092
				Total	\$ 80,092
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
038 ENGA-07 ENG A	Enhancement of RF and Noise Measurement Laboratory for Device, Circuit and System Characterization in the Multi-gigahertz Regime for Wireless and Lightwave Applications	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	Renuka P. Jindal;	1	\$ 80,352
				Total	\$ 80,352
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
039 ENGA-07 ENG A	PC Net and PLC for Logic Control and Electronics Design Technology Laboratory (PLCnet)	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Industrial Technology);	G. H. Massiha; Hebert A. Hebert; Terrence L. Chambers;	1	\$ 59,788
				Total	\$ 59,788
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
040 ENGA-07 ENG A	Multipurpose Cyclic Tensile System to Support Polymer Science and Engineering Teaching and Research Programs	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemical Engineering);	R. D. K. Misra; R. S. Perkins; T. C. Pesacreta;	1	\$ 155,250
				Total	\$ 155,250
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
041 ENGA-07 ENG A	40 Gbit/s Bit-Error-Rate Test Set for Telecommunications Program at EECE Department	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	Zhongqi Pan; George Thomas; Mohammad Madani; Robert Henry;	1	\$ 86,940
				Total	\$ 86,940
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
042ENGA-07 ENG A	Fusion Splicer for the Development of a Multidisciplinary Optical Fiber Program at UL Lafayette	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical and Computer Engineering);	Zhongqi Pan; Boyun Guo; Gongtao Wang; Mohammad Madani;	1	\$ 60,000
				Total	\$ 60,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
043ENGA-07 ENG A	RFID-Based Library Management System: Localization, Data Logging, and Visualization	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Advanced Computer Studies);	Nian-Feng Tzeng; Hongyi Wu;	1	\$ 131,800
				Total	\$ 131,800
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
044ENGA-07 ENG A	Prototyping and Empirical Evaluation of Delay/Fault-Tolerant Mobile Sensor Network (DFT-MSN)	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Advanced Computer Studies);	Hongyi Wu; Nian-Feng Tzeng;	1	\$ 72,000
				Total	\$ 72,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
045 ENGA-07 ENG A	Establishment of Biodiesel Performance Evaluation Capability	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemical Engineering);	Mark E. Zappi; Rakesh Bajpai;	1	\$ 180,000
				Total	\$ 180,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
046 ENGA-07 ENG A	The Design of Communication- Centric Embedded System-on- Chips	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Advanced Computer Studies);	Danella Zhao; Magdy A. Bayoumi;	1	\$ 99,642
				Total	\$ 99,642
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
047 ENGA-07 ENG A	A Multimedia Based Peer Instruction Environment for Curriculum Enhancement and Distance Learning	University of New Orleans (Electrical Engineering);	Huimin Chen; Abdul Alsamman; Dimitrios Charalampidis;	1	\$ 58,794
				Total	\$ 58,794
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
048ENGA-07 ENG A	Communications and Networking Laboratory	University of New Orleans (Electrical Engineering);	Edit J. Kaminsky Bourgeois;	1	\$ 184,674
				Total	\$ 184,674

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

049ENGA-07 ENG A	An Interdisciplinary Center for Bioinformatics	University of New Orleans (Computer Science);	Stephen Winters-Hilt; Mahdi Abdelguerfi;	1	\$ 270,734
				Total	\$ 270,734

E
Proposal is a **New Request**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Engineering A for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
49	\$ 5,600,545	\$ 5,600,545	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07

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 required component 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 2006-07
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 required component 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:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____