

# **2006-07 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

## **Health and Medical Sciences**

### **INTRODUCTION**

A review panel consisting of Dr. John Kendal, Chair, Oregon Health Sciences University; Dr. Thomas Robinson, University of Kentucky; Dr. Vernice Ferguson, University of Pennsylvania; and Dr. John Oates, Vanderbilt University Medical Center met in Baton Rouge on March 22-23, 2007, for the purpose of evaluating thirty-two (32) Health and Medical Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) thirty-two (32) Health and Medical Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2006-07 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2004 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Health and Medical Sciences.

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

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 77. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For many proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations; however, the partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$ 3,798,740 were submitted to the Health and Medical Sciences review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$1,458,459.

**TABLE I****HEALTH/MEDICAL SCIENCES****PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	96	015HEA-07	NICHOLLS	\$141,352	\$106,000	\$0	\$0
2	92	001HEA-07	CENTENARY	\$73,117	\$48,517	\$0	\$0
2	92	004HEA-07	LSU-BR	\$98,690	\$98,690	\$0	\$0
2	92	009HEA-07	LSUHSC-S	\$29,451	\$16,700	\$21,151	\$0
5	91	007HEA-07	LSUHSC-S	\$349,137	\$115,215	\$0	\$0
5	91	028HEA-07	ULM	\$81,619	\$81,619	\$0	\$0
7	90	013HEA-07	LA TECH	\$53,667	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
8	89	014HEA-07	NICHOLLS	\$30,797	\$15,400	\$0	\$0
9	88	016HEA-07	NICHOLLS	\$94,579	\$89,500	\$0	\$0
10	87	005HEA-07	LSU-BR	\$332,000	\$166,000	\$0	\$0
10	87	010HEA-07	LSU-S	\$12,000	\$12,000	\$0	\$0
10	87	025HEA-07	ULM	\$63,730	\$63,730	\$0	\$0
13	86	026HEA-07	ULM	\$78,410	\$40,000	\$0	\$0
13	86	012HEA-07	LA TECH	\$74,455	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
13	86	029HEA-07	ULM	\$66,795	\$34,380	\$0	\$0
13	86	030HEA-07	ULM	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$0	\$0
17	84	020HEA-07	NUNEZ	\$142,701	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
18	83	011HEA-07	LA TECH	\$23,021	\$15,000	\$0	\$0
18	83	018HEA-07	NSU	\$162,000	\$96,900	\$0	\$0
20	82	003HEA-07	LSU-BR	\$89,250	\$89,250	\$0	\$0
20	82	008HEA-07	LSUHSC-S	\$177,116	\$88,558	\$0	\$0
22	80	022HEA-07	SU-BR	\$157,633	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
23	78	006HEA-07	LSUHSC-NO	\$251,600	\$15,000	\$0	\$0
24	77	024HEA-07	ULL	\$161,479	\$50,000	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$2,780,599</b>	<b>\$1,458,459</b>	<b>\$21,151</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**TABLE II**

**HEALTH/MEDICAL SCIENCES**

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

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
25	76	017HEA-07	NICHOLLS	\$48,450	\$31,980
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$48,450</b>	<b>\$31,980</b>

**TABLE III**

**HEALTH/MEDICAL SCIENCES**

**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
26	75	019HEA-07	NSU	\$248,256	\$0	\$0	\$0
26	75	021HEA-07	SLU	\$52,220	\$0	\$0	\$0
28	74	031HEA-07	ULM	\$71,987	\$0	\$0	\$0
29	72	023HEA-07	SU-BR	\$313,300	\$0	\$44,359	\$0
30	70	002HEA-07	LSU-BR	\$47,820	\$0	\$0	\$0
31	69	027HEA-07	ULM	\$110,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
32	66	032HEA-07	ULM	\$126,108	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$969,691</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$44,359</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Centenary Neuroscience: An Enhancement to Pre-Professional  
Health Science Curriculum

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$73,117  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$48,517

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 presents an innovative curricular development that provides promise to students planning to enter the health sciences. The project is led by a new faculty member who has a history of productivity and awards. The panel finds the plan and budget to be very detailed and is impressed by the substantial match by an external teaching grant. The proposal's primary weakness is that the project generally involves only one faculty member. He has a fairly strong, recent research background so an account of the project's value to research could have strengthened the proposal. The panel recommends partial funding, with no funding for furniture recommended. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Videostroboscopic Research and Training

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

70
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$47,820  
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 is a standard equipment request for Speech Language Pathology in the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders. It seeks to upgrade teaching and research capacity with the latest equipment in the field. The videostroboscope will play a role in enhancing curriculum and improving student learning and preparation for practice, and can also be used for faculty research. However, the proposal indicates the instrument will be used for examination of human disorders, which is the type of examination that occurs in a clinical "fee for service" application. The panel questions the efficacy of support of clinical services within the scope of the Enhancement Program. If there is to be shared utilization of the instrument for clinical service functions and for teaching that is completely separate from those clinical uses, then such a division of use would have to be convincingly delineated and the budget proportioned accordingly. Therefore, while the concept for teaching and research is commendable, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instruction in Musculoskeletal Mechanics and Rehabilitation

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

82
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$89,250  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$89,250

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 an equipment request to enhance instruction and research in musculoskeletal mechanics and rehabilitation in the Department of Kinesiology. The Hologic Fluoroscanner InSight, which allows imaging by a fluoroscope and attached computer, is the next generation of equipment in this area of research and allows for assessment of movement and injuries, particularly in the joints. It provides visuals of joint articulation and associated kinetics. It will enhance student learning and faculty research and add to an already good laboratory. The proposal is well-written. The Principal Investigator lists in detail the affected student and faculty research projects and demonstrates the capacity of the proposal to impact curriculum and research. The panel strongly recommends that assurances be provided to the Support Fund through LSU's IRB relative to the safe use of this equipment and is especially concerned about whether or not students will be used as subjects. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Biocompatible Coating (Parylene) Deposition System

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$98,690  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$98,690

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 proposal is an equipment request for a biocompatible coating deposition system that can provide uniform deposition of Parylene to create a stable, uniform, thin, and smooth biocompatible coating on micro-nanoscale devices that are being developed by a productive and well-funded group of investigators. The project will help complete a well-developed infrastructure at the Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices (CAMD). This is a center with productive and diverse microfabrication research that clearly will be advanced by acquisition of this equipment which will provide state of the art capability for rendering a range of micro-electromechanical and nanoelectromechanical systems optimally biocompatible. The project is multidisciplinary and will impact undergraduate education in this area and graduate education in particular. This proposal has a high potential for advancing biotechnology at both university and commercial levels within Louisiana. The panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 7Telsa Wiggler Cryostat Upgrade

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 20 (of 20 points)  
 B.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 8 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$332,000</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$166,000</u>

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

The proposal requests upgrades in the infrastructure of the synchrotron at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge that will provide annual savings of \$80,000 now being spent on helium. Thus, the investment cost could be recovered in four years and the savings could be applied to other uses. The synchrotron is a unique asset for the region and has a wide variety of uses and applications. The proposal is well prepared and justified, though it could have been strengthened by better descriptions of other financial productivity of the users and of the project's educational benefits. The budget cannot be reduced in specific areas. However, the panel recommends funding at half of the requested amount and suggests the remaining funds be covered by other research funds cited in the text. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Educational Enhancements to Support Implementation of the Academy for the Advancement of Educational Scholarship at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-New Orleans

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    13    (of 20 points)  
 B.3    17    (of 25 points)  
 B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     4     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$251,600</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$15,000</u>

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

This is an ambitious and multifaceted proposal for activities related to an academy of faculty that is intended to be devoted to enhancing the process of education. The investigators bring experience, enthusiasm and published scholarship to the project. The proposal is considered premature in that the academy has not yet been formed and there are no teaching faculty who are participants in a project that requires their commitment to succeed. The curriculum and program design for the Master Educator Program is not provided for review, nor is any commitment of appropriate financial support for the salaries of faculty who participate. The proposal would benefit from more focus on the components that the applicants deem to have the highest priority. The panel recommends partial funding of \$15,000 for the Teaching and Learning Resource Collection to provide restoration of the collection destroyed by Hurricane Katrina that will serve as a resource for the proposed enhancement of educational scholarship. The institutional mach may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Simulation Technology for Advanced Medical Education

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

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1     9     (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     4     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No     X    

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$349,137</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$115,215</u>

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

The proposal is a request by the medical school in Shreveport to expand its simulation center with several units of equipment that will broaden the education of medical and PA students as well as residents. This is part of a national trend to simulate interactions between doctors/nurses and patients and will add to experiences in direct patient care. The work plan is well presented and justified. The faculty is well versed in medical education. The educational applications of the equipment and the affected courses were well described. Because the request is substantial in relation to the funds available, the panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the Principal Investigator's discretion. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Now for the Future II

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

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    12    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     4     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$177,116</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$88,558</u>

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

The proposal requests a motion analysis system. The school does not currently have one and, therefore, it is not in keeping with the current directives of governing and accrediting bodies. The faculty is engaged in research and is well published. Earlier grant funding in the purchase of new equipment enabled new faculty/student research initiatives that resulted in five publications. With very limited funds available this year, the panel recommends partial funding at half the requested amount. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center-Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborative Oncology Nursing Curriculum Enhancement Initiative (CONCEI)

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$29,451</u>	<u>\$21,151</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$16,700</u>	<u>\$0</u>

This proposal aims to provide expertise in oncology classroom instruction as part of the clinical curriculum in existing courses and in the development of summer electives in oncology nursing in a collaborative setting with 3 other nursing schools. Impressive letters of support are included. The funding request is for two years. In view of very limited funds available this year the panel recommends only partial funding of the first-year request, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the Principal Investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

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

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Principles of Genetics Laboratory at LSUS

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

87
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$12,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$12,000

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 proposal to enhance the "Principles of Genetics" course by assisting in the acquisition of small items of equipment and reagents for the laboratory component of the course. The initial development of the course was funded by the Support Fund, and the curriculum is designed to prepare students for research in the field and for entry into advanced degree programs including medicine. The Principal Investigator is experienced in genetics research and has been a leader in development of this curriculum. The other participants are well qualified for planning and executing the laboratory. The panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Audiology Program at Louisiana Tech University

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

83
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$23,021  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$15,000

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

This proposal is an equipment request from the Audiology program at Louisiana Tech. Given that the discipline of Audiology has moved from entry level at the master's degree to the doctoral degree (Au.D.), the number of students has increased and those increased numbers of students are now required by accreditation to have a six-fold increase in supervised on-site hours by faculty in clinical service. This has created a need for more equipment in general and hence the proposal contains a large list of new equipment to enhance their instructional laboratory. Funding will certainly enhance their academic program for improved student learning and the curriculum will be enhanced. In general the proposal is well written but some sections are placed in the wrong categories. The faculty can benefit from the equipment in their research roles. The panel recommends partial funding with reductions made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Bioimaging and Digital Microscopy Training Laboratory

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

86
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$74,455  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

This is a strong proposal to upgrade the imaging equipment in the biotechnical units at Louisiana Tech University. A new set of sophisticated microscopes will be housed in a bioimaging laboratory available for student education and research as well as faculty research. The proposal includes detailed and specific descriptions of the courses that will benefit. More detail could have been presented about the research benefits for the faculty, individual faculty responsibilities, and the impact on the economy and culture. There is a substantial match by the sponsoring units of the university. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions made at the PI's discretion. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Healthcare Data Management and Mining Laboratory

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    12    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     4     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	\$53,667	\$0
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	\$30,000	\$0

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

This is a proposal from the Health Information Management Department at Louisiana Tech to upgrade and enhance undergraduate education. Like many of the other proposals it makes the case for improved student learning and preparation for clinical practice through teaching equipment upgrades. The improved equipment will also be used by faculty for research programs. The proposal is well written and well justified. Because of the limited funds available, the panel recommends partial funding, with the institutional match to be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Applied Nutrition 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 10 (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:** \$30,797  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$15,400

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 equipment to teach health assessment techniques in order to enhance the educational experiences of students. The program in dietetics at Nicholls State is the only undergraduate program of its kind in southeastern Louisiana and includes two full-time, well-prepared and nationally known faculty. Because of the limited funds available this year, the panel recommends partial funding, with reductions made at the PI's discretion. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Genomics Enhancement for Health and Medical Pre-Professional Instruction

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$141,352  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$106,000

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

This is a well-balanced proposal for DNA sequencing equipment to enhance both education and research at Nicholls State University. The biology department serves a large number of pre-professional students and in particular offers a key course in genomics, which added equipment will bolster. Researchers will also benefit from the addition. The panel notes the substantial institutional match. Partial funding is recommended for the purchase of the sequencer itself. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Laboratory, Research, and Scholarly Experiences for Health Science Students

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

88
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$94,579  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$89,500

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

This proposal aims to enhance the academic experiences for Health Science students studying biology by providing them with access to instrumentation that will optimize training for research, clinical and public health careers. The proposal seeks to replace a very outdated and malfunctioning ultra-low temperature freezer that is essential for teaching and research in virology, a teaching microscope capable of fluorescence and image acquisition, a bench top ultracentrifuge, and an interactive LCD screen as a teaching tool. The research in the department includes endeavors that are highly germane to this unique region, including marine biology, toxic and infectious agents in the marine environment, and the genetics of inherited diseases in this population. The Principal Investigator (PI) and Co-PIs are productive and well qualified to achieve the education and research goals that are to be enhanced by this proposal. The panel recommends partial funding for the four items listed under Equipment, totaling \$89,500. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expansion of Anatomy and Physiology Laboratory Experiences for Nursing and Allied Health Sciences

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

76
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 15 points)  
B.3 13 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 0 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: \$48,450  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$31,980  
(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 funds to enhance laboratory courses in Human Anatomy and Physiology involving six of the eighteen faculty members. A new lab manual was adopted in 2006, and at present the available equipment is worn and inadequate for the demands of the institution. There are 975 students that are affected. Only one complete and relatively new torso is available and new equipment is needed. The proposed improvements will make available technology in current cardiophysiology and engage students in learning renal, digestive and respiratory physiology. However, due to a limited amount of available funds this year, the panel recommends partial funding only if additional funds become available. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Integration to Enhance Student Clinical Competencies  
in Radiologic Technology

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$162,000  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$96,900

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 aims to enhance the competence of Radiologic Technology students in the use of digital imaging technology, which is the dominant technology employed in modern radiology units. The specific request is to upgrade one simulated learning laboratory and establish a second that includes energized digital imaging systems. The well-trained Principal Investigator is active and funded in curriculum development and implementation. The student body, 305 of whom are Radiologic Technology majors, includes a strong minority presence (32%). The panel recommends partial funding of \$96,900 for the two Afga digital imaging simulators, with the expectation that the funds required for implementing these learning systems will be provided by the University and Medical Center partners in this training endeavor. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Pre-Health and Pre-Medical Science Programs with NMR Spectroscopy

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

75
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 15 points)  
B.3 14 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$248,256  
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 is aimed at upgrading NMR spectroscopy capability from a currently available 60 Mhz machine to a 400 Mhz unit that will substantially augment the educational opportunities for pre-professional students at Northwestern State University and affiliated institutions (Southern University at Shreveport and Bossier Parish Community College). The Scholars' College of Northwestern, a research-requiring educational unit, would be strengthened in particular. The educational benefits are described in convincing detail and the faculty is prepared to gain maximal use from the improvement. While several faculty members have research backgrounds, there is relatively little emphasis in the proposal on its non-educational research benefits. It should be noted that this is a high-priced instrument and basically an all-or-nothing budget. The institutional match is substantial but will not offset any of the high cost of the machine and the significant amount of the request. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 020-HEA-07

**INSTITUTION:** Nunez Community College

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancing Health and Medical Sciences in the Community College

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 84 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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:** \$142,701  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:** \$50,000

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

This is a request for a very large number of small pieces of equipment and supplies to support the educational offerings in health & sciences. About 50% of students have returned after the 2005 hurricanes and of these 75% are taking courses in Allied Health and Medical Sciences. The individual pieces of equipment and supplies are not individually justified, but it is obvious that these are basic needs for health and sciences educational programs. Many sections of the application lack detail. It is possible for the budget to be substantially reduced while still supporting the intent of the program. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the Principal Investigator's discretion. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 021-HEA-07

**INSTITUTION:** Southeastern Louisiana University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Dual Energy X-ray Absorptiometry: Using DXA to Educate Students  
and the Community about Body Composition, Obesity, and  
Osteoporosis

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

**H. Total Score:** 75 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2     9     (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     8     (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**     \$52,220      
**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 aims to employ Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry (DEXA) to enhance student learning about body composition, obesity and osteoporosis through their participation in research with this device. The Department of Kinesiology and Health Studies, in which the teaching and research will be conducted, is the largest in Louisiana, with 600 undergraduate majors and 60 graduate students. The Principal Investigator (PI) has experience with this technology. The equipment would be employed to teach body composition and its relation to health in a number of courses and in research in which "students will be able to track the changes and improvements in bone density and body composition with some sort of dietary or exercise intervention". No evidence is presented that it is feasible to determine statistically significant changes in either of these parameters that are outside of the instrument's standard deviation of measurement with interventions that are possible within the time frame of a student research project. The potential for meaningful student research is not convincing. Current research funding is available only to a single Co-PI. It should also be noted that this is an X-ray machine and, while the radiation emitted is small, it is not zero. The University should be prepared to consider this application in student education very carefully before it is implemented. The panel does not recommend funding at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022-HEA-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Enhanced Curriculum for Nursing Education

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     4     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$157,633</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$50,000</u>

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

The proposal requests equipment to provide substantial assistance for education and preparation for the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX). Presently, there are limited numbers of computers at Southern University in Baton Rouge, which puts students at a disadvantage when taking this exam. Furthermore, enhancement of the School of Nursing's baccalaureate program will increase the use of web-based activities that promote critical thinking. Health promotion and the assessment and monitoring of patients is desired, along with increased utilization of computerized testing. The panel recommends partial funding because of the relatively small amount of funds available this year. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 023-HEA-07

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Preparing School-based Speech-Language Pathologists for the 21st Century

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**H. Total Score:** 72 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$313,300</u>	<u>\$44,359</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is an ambitious proposal from the Department of Special Education - Speech Language Pathology at Southern University-Baton Rouge. The purpose of the proposal is to enhance the curriculum for SLP students with an Evidence-Based Practice Framework and Responsiveness to Intervention Model. It is presented as an enhancement project, not primarily an equipment project. However, \$241,000 from a budget of \$313,000 is for a single piece of equipment. The remainder is a few other pieces of equipment as well as release-time for participating faculty. It will impact students and the curriculum. However, the justification is not strong enough for such a substantial request. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Maternal Child Nursing Skills Through Patient Simulation

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 77 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     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.)**

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$161,479</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$50,000</u>

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

This is a well-described proposal to augment a simulation laboratory to assist in the teaching of maternal child nursing. The importance of acquiring such equipment is a result of the reluctance of patients in the obstetrics/pediatrics units to permit unskilled student involvement and the increased shift of care from inpatient to outpatient sites. While the budget is fairly large, partial funding would certainly help in this critical sector of nursing education. Because the principal faculty members in the project have a history of scholarly activity, the proposal could have been made stronger by citing any specific research that might evolve from the project. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the Principal Investigator's discretion. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

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

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$63,730    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$63,730    </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 a College of Pharmacy proposal from the University of Louisiana at Monroe. The Principal Investigator (PI), who is an experienced and capable researcher, seeks funding for a 5µm Capillary Microflow NMR probe. The PI makes the case that this new equipment fills a current void for measuring small volumes of substances in the laboratory. The proposal convincingly provides summaries of the research projects that are waiting in the wings for this piece of equipment. It is well-written, well-presented, and the panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Clinical Simulation Center for the School of Nursing

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,410  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,000

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 very good proposal to upgrade simulation equipment and acquire a suitable location for its use in the School of Nursing in Monroe. The school already has manikins but needs the upgrade and additional peripherals to stay abreast of this rapidly moving field of clinical education. The principal strength of the proposal is a well-versed faculty and a solid plan for utilization. While additional use for research is cited as a value to the faculty, there is virtually no evidence of productivity or support. Several sources of extra financial support add to the attractiveness of the proposal. The panel recommends partial funding because of the limited funds available this year. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

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

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1     6     (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     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:     \$110,000      
RECOMMENDATIONS:      Recommended Amount:           \$0          

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

This proposal requests support for a Microarray facility in the College of Pharmacy at UL-Monroe, with the goal of enhancing drug discovery and pharmacologic research as well as the educational process. The Principal Investigator (PI) has experience with microarray, but has no funded research or independent publications that indicate a capability for independent investigation. A number of experienced and productive investigators in the College utilize this technology, but only by the unsatisfactory method of shipping mRNA samples to outside labs. The description of the impact on curriculum and instruction is vague. The writing contains numerous grammatical and typographical errors. The panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dispersive Raman Spectrometer for the Enhancement of  
Pharmaceutical Sciences at ULM

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

91
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$81,619  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$81,619

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

This well-developed proposal serves both research and educational needs of the College of Pharmacy at UL-Monroe. It requests funds for the acquisition of a Raman spectrometer that will permit real-time analysis of a number of biological reactions, enhancing the research projects of well-funded faculty members as well as supporting several pharmacy courses. It is backed by a sizable match from the institution. Several minor weaknesses were identified, but on balance the proposal is very well laid out and the budget is appropriate. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Laser Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer for the Enhancement  
of Pharmaceutical Research and Education at ULM

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 18 (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 6 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,795  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$34,380

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 proposal requests funding for a Laser Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer for enhancement of research and education in the UL-Monroe College of Pharmacy. The instrument provides the state-of-the-art method for determining the particle size of pharmaceutical products over a wide size range and in both liquid and solid samples. This will complement the existing capabilities in the College and strengthen capability for collaboration in pharmaceutical development. The Principal Investigator (PI) is experienced and well-published in this field, and has received other funding for his research. A convincing plan for enhancing curriculum related to this type of analysis is presented. One-fourth of the project's cost will be provided by the University. The panel recommends partial funding of \$34,380 that will cover the cost of purchase of the instrument. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Completion of the State-of-the-Art Clinical Pharmacy Research  
Laboratory

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ X \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$36,000  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$36,000

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

This proposal from the branch campus at Shreveport of the UL-Monroe College of Pharmacy is a request for funds to replace out-dated equipment in the clinical pharmacy research laboratory. There is only a single Principal Investigator (PI) with no Co-PIs, which is a concern for the panel. However, it is very well justified and will update a significant piece of equipment, a capillary electrophoresis unit, that will be useful for both research and education. The panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrade to the Radiologic Technology Teaching Laboratory

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1     6     (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     1     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes     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:     \$71,987      
 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 radiology technology program at the University of Louisiana at Monroe requests an upgrading of its basic X-ray equipment. The justification for the machine and its impact on the education of radiation technology students is well-presented and rests primarily on the fact that one older basic machine is inoperative and the other is not modern. Sadly, replacement equipment does not appear to be built into the ongoing budget. What is not made clear is whether or not this will be used for clinical service of any sort, which would offset the cost. Experiential research opportunities are also cited but without detail of faculty expertise in this area. Additional details, such as how the impact would be evaluated, were not presented. The budget is essentially all-or-none for the single piece of equipment. Lacking pertinent information, the panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032-HEA-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Breaking Barriers

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$126,108  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This is a proposal from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education that requests funding for equipment to train students, faculty and teachers. The project seeks to equip teachers entering the educational system with new competencies and will better prepare them to deal with disabilities. It is an adequately written document, but is not appropriate to the Health Sciences discipline and should be resubmitted under the education discipline in a future competition. The panel does not recommend funding.

# Appendix A

## Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Traditional Enhancement Program - Health and Medical Sciences  
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>001H/M-07 HEA</b>	Centenary Neuroscience: An Enhancement to Pre -Professional Health Science Curriculum	Centenary College (Biology);	Greg Q. Butcher;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 73,117</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 73,117</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>002H/M-07 HEA</b>	Videostroboscopic Research and Training	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Communication Sciences & Disorders);	Melda Kunduk;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 47,820</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 47,820</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

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

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>003H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Instruction in Musculoskeletal Mechanics and Rehabilitation	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Kinesiology);	Dennis Landin; Melissa Thompson; Ray Castle;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 89,250</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 89,250</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>004H/M-07 HEA</b>	Biocompatible Coating (Parylene) Deposition System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices);	Varshni Singh; James Henry; Jin - Woo Choi; Jost Goettert; Mandi J. Lopez; Ram V. Devireddy; Todd Monroe;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 98,690</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 98,690</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>005H/M-07 HEA</b>	7Tesla Wiggler Cryostat Upgrade	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices);	Victor Suller; Kevin Morris; Mikhail Fedurin;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 332,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 332,000</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>006H/M-07 HEA</b>	Educational Enhancements to Support Implementation of the Academy for the Advancement of Educational Scholarship at Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans (The Academy)	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - New Orleans (Office of Medical Education Research and Development);	Sheila W. Chauvin; Chris Flug; Jack Scott; Tong Yang;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 251,600</b>
N				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 251,600</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>007H/M-07 HEA</b>	Simulation Technology for Advanced Medical Education	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - Shreveport (Education Program Development);	Jane Eggerstedt; Andrew L. Chesson, Jr.; Donna Carden; Peggy Murphy; Timothy Gilbert;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 349,137</b>
E				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 349,137</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>008H/M-07 HEA</b>	Technology Now for the Future II	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - Shreveport (Physical Therapy);	Clinton F. Frilot, II; James Bellew; Marie Vazquez-Morgan; Mary Denney; Paula Click-Fenter; Sharon Dunn; Suzanne Tinsley;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 177,116</b>
E				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 177,116</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>009H/M-07 HEA</b>	Collaborative Oncology Nursing Curriculum Enhancement Initiative (CONCEI)	Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center - Shreveport (Medicine); Grambling State University; Northwestern State University; University of Louisiana at Monroe;	Jonathan Glass; Amy Kincannon; Anna Karin Jones; Debra P. Shelton; Florencetta Gibson; Janice Britton; Karen Canady -Barnes; Karen Barnes; Margaret Gray; Veronica J. Poole;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 29,451</b> <b>\$ 21,151</b> <b>\$ 50,602</b>
N Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>010H/M-07 BS</b>	Enhancement of the Principles of Genetics Laboratory at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Tara Williams-Hart; M. Cran Lucas; Nathan Hutchings; Stephanie Aamodt;	<b>1</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 12,000</b> <b>\$ 12,000</b>
E Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>011H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of the Audiology Program at Louisiana Tech University	Louisiana Tech University (Speech);	Melinda C. Freyaldenhoven; Matthew D. Bryan; Steven G. Madix;	<b>1</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,021</b> <b>\$ 23,021</b>
E Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>012H/M-07 HEA</b>	Bioimaging and Digital Microscopy Training Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Biological Sciences);	David K. Mills; Alfred Gunasekaran; Mark Decoster; Sidney Sit;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 74,455</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 74,455</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>013H/M-07 HEA</b>	Undergraduate Healthcare Data Management and Mining Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Health Information Management);	Prerna Sethi; Helen Baxter; Jan Fuller; Kimberly Theodos; Michele Martin;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 53,667</b> <b>\$</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 53,667</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>014H/M-07 HEA</b>	Applied Nutrition Laboratory Enhancement	Nicholls State University (Nursing and Allied Health);	Simone Camel; Colette Leistner;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 30,797</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 30,797</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>015H/M-07 HEA</b>	Genomics Enhancement for Health and Medical Pre -Professional Instruction	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	John P. Doucet; Gary J. LaFleur; Rajkumar Nathaniel; Ramaraj Boopathy;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 141,352</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 141,352</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>016H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Laboratory, Research, and Scholarly Experiences for Health Science Students	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Rajkumar Nathaniel; Enmin Zou; Gary J. LaFleur; John Doucet; Marilyn Kilgen;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 94,579</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 94,579</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>017H/M-07 HEA</b>	Expansion of Anatomy and Physiology Laboratory Experiences for Nursing and Allied Health Sciences	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	S. Michele Robichaux; Angie Corbin; Lois D. Nelson; Rajkumar Nathaniel;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 48,450</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 48,450</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>018H/M-07 HEA</b>	Technology Integration to Enhance Student Clinical Competencies in Radiologic Technology	Northwestern State University (Radiologic Technology);	Laura Aaron; Kendall DeLacerda; Rebecca Britt;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 162,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 162,000</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>019H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Pre-Health and Pre-Medical Science Programs with NMR Spectroscopy	Northwestern State University (Scholars' College);	Massimo D. Bezoari; Andrei Ludu; Darrell Fry; Gillian Rudd;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 248,256</b> <b>\$</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 248,256</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>020H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Health and Medical Sciences in the Community College	Nunez Community College (Allied Health and Natural Science);	Stephen Waddell; Klaus Heyer;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 142,701</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 142,701</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>021H/M-07 HEA</b>	Dual Energy X-ray Aborptiometry: Using DXA to Educate Students and the Community about Body Composition, Obesity, and Osteoporosis	Southeastern Louisiana University (Kinesiology and Health Studies);	Bovorn Sirikul; Ann Carruth; Robert R. Kraemer;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 52,220</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 52,220</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>022H/M-07 HEA</b>	Technology Enhanced Curriculum for Nursing Education	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Nursing);	Sharon W. Hutchinson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 157,633</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 157,633</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>023H/M-07 HEA</b>	Preparing School-based Speech- Language Pathologists for the 21st Century	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Special Education and Communication Disorders);	Elaine B. Lewnau;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 313,300</b> <b>\$ 44,359</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 357,659</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>024H/M-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Maternal Child Nursing Skills Through Patient Stimulation	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Nursing);	Lisa Broussard; Gwen Leigh; Helen Hurst;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 161,479</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 161,479</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>025H/M-07 HEA</b>	CapNMR Flow Microprobe Enhancement of ULM College of Pharmacy NMR Spectrometer	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Khalid A. El Sayed; Ronald A. Hill; Seetharama D. Jois;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 63,730</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 63,730</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>026H/M-07 HEA</b>	A Clinical Simulation Center for the School of Nursing	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Nursing);	Donna R. Glaze; Jan Shows; Rayne Lowder;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 78,410</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 78,410</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>027H/M-07 HEA</b>	Establishment of Microarray Facility to Promote Drug Discovery and Pharmacology Study at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Yong -Yu Liu; Girish V. Shah; Harihara M. Mehendale; Karen P. Briski; Paul W. Sylvester;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 110,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 110,000</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>028H/M-07 HEA</b>	Dispersive Raman Spectrometer for the Enhancement of Pharmaceutical Sciences at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Sami Nazzal; Karen P. Briski; Khalid A. El Sayed; Ronald A. Hill;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 81,619</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 81,619</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>029H/M-07 HEA</b>	A Laser Diffraction Particle Size Analyzer for the Enhancement of Pharmaceutical Research and Education at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences);	Sami Nazzal; Alamdar Hussain;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 66,795</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 66,795</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>030H/M-07 HEA</b>	Completion of the State-of-the-Art Clinical Pharmacy Research Laboratory	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Clinical & Administrative Sciences);	Roy C. Parish;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 36,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 36,000</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>031H/M-07 HEA</b>	Upgrade to the Radiologic Technology Teaching Laboratory	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Clinical Laboratory Science and Radiologic Technology);	Michael K. Ramsey; Brett H. Bennett;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 71,987</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 71,987</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>032H/M-07 HEA</b>	Breaking Barriers	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Curriculum and Instruction); Region VII Assistive Technology Center;	Thillainatarajan Sivakumaran; Glenda Holland;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 126,108</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 126,108</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Health and Medical Sciences for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle</b>			
<b>Total Number of Proposals Submitted</b>	<b>Total First-Year Funds Requested</b>	<b>Total Funds Requested</b>	<b>Total First-Year Funds Available</b>
32	\$ 3,798,740	\$ 3,864,250	\$

# 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: \_\_\_\_\_