

**REPORT TO THE  
LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**REVIEW OF HUMANITIES ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS**

**March 2006**

Prepared by:

**Dr. Raymond Gay-Crosier  
Professor  
Department of Romance Languages and Literatures  
University of Florida  
Chairman**

**Dr. George Rable  
Professor  
Department of History  
University of Alabama**

# **2005-06 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

## **HUMANITIES**

### **INTRODUCTION**

A review panel in the Humanities consisting of Professors Raymond Gay-Crosier (French), Chair of the panel, University of Florida, and George Rable (History), University of Alabama, met via teleconference on March 28, 2006, for the purpose of evaluating eighteen (18) Humanities proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund Program.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) eighteen (18) Humanities proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; and c) the FY 2005-06 Enhancement Request for Proposals.

Prior to the teleconference, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the eighteen proposals. These evaluations were then exchanged for extensive comment and review. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached on a proposal's ranking, budget recommendation, and comments. The reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted in the Humanities discipline (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

As in previous years, partial awards were recommended in many cases due to considerable budget limitations. Downward adjustments to funds requested were determined by a detailed review of the budgets, which resulted in a recommended funding amount corresponding to the most pressing documented need(s). First-year requests totaling \$1,093,447 were submitted to the Humanities review panel. Second-year requests totaled \$258,266 and were, in most cases, not funded. The total amount of first-year funds recommended for expenditure is \$538,958, and the total second-year funding recommended is \$52,198.

#### Panel Recommendations and Suggestions:

- External matching funds and institutional matching strengthen grant applications and should be pursued as a matter of course. Conversely, the absence of significant internal matching indicates a lack of institutional interest in the proposal.
- Budget justifications included in proposals often presented insufficient information on the items requested. In some cases, funding was requested for activities not allowed by the Board of Regents. Applicants are urged to read carefully the RFP section detailing disallowed budgetary items, remove any disallowed items from their budgets, and ensure that all requests provide adequate information for the panel to make reasonable recommendations to the Board of Regents.
- The panel strongly recommends that the ratings forms be provided to reviewers in spreadsheet form to facilitate calculation of scores.

**TABLE I****PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	85	004HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$39,340	\$36,340		
2	83	012HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$68,335	\$55,275		
3	81	014HUM-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$48,041	\$48,041		
4	80	002HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$17,000	\$17,000		
4	80	011HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$20,278	\$20,278	\$35,198	\$35,198
6	78	013HUM-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$47,723	\$33,375		
7	75	017HUM-06	TULANE	\$57,405	\$17,000	\$56,170	\$17,000
8	72	003HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$49,860	\$49,860	\$18,980	\$0
8	72	008HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$53,966	\$40,526		
8	72	009HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$78,073	\$53,311		
8	72	016HUM-06	SUBR	\$71,779	\$64,445		
12	71	006HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$53,100	\$53,100	\$53,100	\$0
13	70	015HUM-06	LA TECH	\$149,150	\$50,407		
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$754,050</b>	<b>\$538,958</b>	<b>\$163,448</b>	<b>\$52,198</b>

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

**TABLE II****PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
14	68	010HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$19,473	\$0		
15	67	005HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$33,174	\$0		
15	67	018HUM-06	UNO	\$67,475	\$0		
17	66	001HUM-06	CENTENARY	\$32,515	\$0	\$61,800	\$0
18	61	007HUM-06	LSU-BR	\$186,760	\$0	\$33,098	\$0
				<b>\$339,397</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$94,898</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001HUM-06**

Institution: Centenary College of Louisiana

Title of Proposal: Giving Reasons: Fostering Ethical Discussion in Northwest Louisiana

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
B.2    15    (of 20 points)  
B.3    17    (of 25 points)  
B.4     3     (of 5 points)  
B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     X     No \_\_\_\_\_

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

C.1     7     (of 12 points)

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

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     1     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No     X    

**G. Total Score** **66** (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**



Requested Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$32,515   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$61,800*   </u>
Recommended Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>          \$0   </u>	Yr. 2 <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.)

While the goals of this outreach program signal good intentions, the conditions for its success are prohibitive. As conceived, it is primarily a training program for two junior faculty members. Moreover, its public impact beyond the proposed two-year grant period is questionable. The panel also did not have confidence in the plan to find a trainer at the visiting assistant professor level with an M.D. and a Ph.D. The public discussion of bioethical issues is an important project and will only grow more so in the future. Given this, the PIs should consider how to pursue their worthy goals in a more practical and cost-effective way and resubmit a revised proposal for this project. No funding is recommended.

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

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: The Francophone Heritage of Louisiana: The Compilation of a Corpus of Early Louisiana French Correspondence

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

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

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

C.1  11  (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   9  (For NS/NE)

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   1  (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   X  

**G. Total Score**   80   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:   \$17,000    
Recommended Amount:   \$17,000  

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

The goal and method of this project, which addresses an important source of Louisiana's cultural legacy, are clearly articulated. The only exception is the lack of proper criteria used to select the letters to be included in the pilot electronic corpus. Also problematic is the extensive reliance on graduate students with limited if any training in the transcription of letters - some dating back to the colonial period - whose handwriting often is nearly indecipherable. The ungrammaticality of some of these letters adds to the difficulty. The credentials of the proposed supervising graduate assistant do not indicate the required expertise in these areas. Nevertheless, the PIs have the training to lead this project and there is no doubt it will significantly contribute to cultural resources available for the study of Louisiana. The institutional match is not given a specific use in the budget justification, but should be fully maintained and its use specified in contract negotiations. The panel recommends full funding of \$17,000.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: The Southern Women Authors Project

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    17    (of 20 points)  
B.3    14    (of 25 points)  
B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
B.6     4     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     X     No \_\_\_\_\_

**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     7     (For NS/NE)

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     0     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score**     72     (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**



Requested Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$49,860   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$18,980   </u>
Recommended Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$49,860   </u>	Yr. 2 <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 clearly a new-generation, 21<sup>st</sup>-century project. Crisply presented and argued, it proposes a technological resource and pedagogical tool available to a broad range of academic and non-academic users. It also features a strong interdisciplinary component. While the evaluators are sympathetic to the request for the two-year funding, the project should find a way to sustain activities like website maintenance, promotional printing, and travel beyond Board of Regents support, which is necessarily limited in time and money. The panel therefore recommends funding for one year only at the level proposed. The institutional match for year 1 should be maintained in full, though the match for year 2 may be eliminated.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Cajun and Creole on the Web: Online Courses for Louisiana’s Heritage Languages

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    20    (of 20 points)  
B.3    19    (of 25 points)  
B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     X     No           

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

C.1    12    (of 12 points)

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

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     2     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No           

**G. Total Score**     85     (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:           \$39,340  
Recommended Amount:           \$36,340

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.)

Based on a solid foundation and recognized expertise of the program proponents, this on-line course in Creole should not only provide a desirable academic service but also contribute to the preservation of Louisiana’s cultural and linguistic heritage. This proposal rises considerably above the typical request for support of on-line courses and meets a genuine and demonstrable need. While the budget appears to be cost-effective, the evaluators believe that the project can be successful with a reduction in the allocation for technical support and recommends a decrease of \$3,000 in this line item. Thus the panel recommends funding of \$36,340; institutional match should be maintained in full. The panel reminds the PIs that travel supported through BoRSF monies must be adhere to all State guidelines, and that all faculty salary must be offset by release time or be part of nine- or ten-month faculty’s summer support. Both these items should be fully documented during contract negotiations.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Beyond Conversion and Syncretism: Indigenous Encounters with Missionary Christianity. An International Conference To Be Held at LSU

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    15    (of 20 points)  
 B.3    17    (of 25 points)  
 B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes     X     No           

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1     9     (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     1     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No           

**G. Total Score**

67

 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$33,174  
 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 purpose of this interdisciplinary proposal is to provide a catalyst for an increased institutional focus on international studies. The topic of the conference and the ensuing proceedings reflect a cultural anthropology focus, the intent of which is to initiate a greater dialogue on several cross-cultural and cross-religious issues that are increasingly in the center of public attention. The program is well planned and identifies the names and background of the invited experts. However, it is doubtful that the number of paying attendees from the LSU community will be sufficient to cover the costs of meals and materials as the proposal assumes, which might affect the quality of the end product. The panel questions, too, the extent to which this project will enhance its host department's education and research agendas. The proposal would benefit from a stronger argument for the breadth of its impact. No funding is recommended.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Proposal to Enhance the Program in Louisiana and Caribbean Studies at Louisiana State University

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    13    (of 20 points)  
 B.3    18    (of 25 points)  
 B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes     X     No           

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     2     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No           

**G. Total Score**

71

 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**



Requested Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$53,100   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$53,100*   </u>
Recommended Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$53,100   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>       \$0       </u>

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

This proposal draws on a well-established program with a highly qualified faculty. The proposal made a strong case for the impact of speakers both within the program and in the larger context of a university's academic discourse. The combination of programs to be offered in a cost-effective way also added strength to this proposal. This project has great promise to enhance both undergraduate and graduate student education in Louisiana and Caribbean studies. Though two years of funding is requested, the project should actively seek ways to sustain project activities beyond Board of Regents support, which is necessarily limited. The panel therefore recommends funding for one year only at the level proposed. The institutional match for year 1 should be maintained in full, though the match for year 2 may be eliminated.

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

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Early English Books Online

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1   3   (of 5 points)  
B.2  10  (of 20 points)  
B.3  16  (of 25 points)  
B.4   3  (of 5 points)  
B.5   2  (of 2 points)  
B.6   3  (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes   X  No \_\_\_\_\_

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

C.1   8   (of 12 points)

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

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

**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** **61** (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**



Requested Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>  \$186,760  </u>	Yr. 2 <u>  \$33,098  </u>
Recommended Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>  \$0  </u>	Yr. 2 <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.)

There is no doubt that the Early English Books Online archive and text-creation partnership are important and, in some cases, indispensable sources for faculty and students in a number of disciplines. The direct participation in the project of PIs representing the major departmental beneficiaries and cogent explanations of the value of these resources to their respective fields would enhance this proposal and better justify its high cost. A group of these departments could also better share the engine availability fee that will continue to be charged beyond the second year, when Board of Regents funding would cease. Because of its high cost and questionable cost-to-benefit ratio, no funding is recommended.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Writing Teacher Training and On-line Book Development Lab

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    11    (of 15 points)  
 B.3    16    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes     X     No           

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1     9     (of 12 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)

**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    

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$53,966  
 Recommended Amount:                     \$40,526

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

The case is well argued by the PI, who introduced an on-line writing instruction method to his program. There are many potential beneficiaries of this project's activities (graduate teaching assistants, writing instructors, and undergraduates) and the project's impact is likely to be high. Institutional provisions for maintenance and lab space appear to be adequate, though the absence of institutional match is disappointing, particularly given the large user pool for this facility and its likely effect on a significant group of students and faculty across the university. The plan to create a self-sustaining teacher development center through royalties generated by the e-book is laudable. The panel believes, however, that the project can be successful with decreased funding for the equipment and recommends reduced funding of \$40,526 to support the purchase of fewer or less expensive notebook computers.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL  
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Archival Storage and On-Line Collection Access for Instruction and Public Outreach at the LSU Textile and Costume Museum

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes     X     No           

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                   \$78,073  
 Recommended Amount:                   \$53,311

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 track record of this program is excellent as are its likely public and academic impacts. The proposal offers a solid rationale for current space and preservation needs of the Textile and Costume Museum and a strong intermediate solution (future growth being inevitable). The budget seems somewhat excessive, so the panel recommends that the request for the steel fixture storage cabinets be reduced from \$49,762 to \$25,000. This will enable an adequate expansion of storage space over the near term. While the expansion will be smaller than anticipated, the high-density storage system, which will be added to the current system, is excellent and the panel fully endorses its purchase. The panel therefore recommends reduced funding of \$53,311. Institutional match should be maintained in full.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: The Hispanic World: Current Trends in Hispanic Cultural Studies

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
B.2    17    (of 20 points)  
B.3    18    (of 25 points)  
B.4     3     (of 5 points)  
B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes            No     X    

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

C.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     0     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes            No     X    

**G. Total Score**     68     (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$19,473  
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.)

While the list of speakers proposed for this project is impressive, the topics they would present in their public lectures are not articulated beyond the general conference theme. Moreover, it is understood that speaker series have a limited impact on curriculum, faculty and student development. Though the amount requested is minimal, the ability of the project to contribute measurably to the enhancement of the participating departments is questionable. No funding is recommended.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: The Louisiana Shakespeare Project: Completing the First Stage

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    17    (of 20 points)  
B.3    19    (of 25 points)  
B.4     3     (of 5 points)  
B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     X     No           

**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)

**E. Additional Funding Sources**  
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     1     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No           

**G. Total Score**     80     (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	Requested			
	Amount:	Yr. 1	<u>   \$20,278   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$35,198   </u>
	Recommended			
	Amount:	Yr. 1	<u>   \$20,278   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$35,198   </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 valuable project with a strong promise of positive impact. Its particular merit is its efforts beyond strengthening LSU's Shakespeare studies group. The group plans to include faculty, teachers, and students in Renaissance studies and other LSU departments, K-12 schools, and the public at large through its website. The cost-benefit ratio is also impressive; the relatively modest budget yields substantial effects by subsidizing four strands of activities – a lecture series, summer institute, theatrical event, and conference. Significant institutional match is pledged. It should be noted, however, that the request for salary from the Board of Regents is not well justified, and it is not clear that LSU is providing any release for the time faculty participants are paid by the Board. This must be clarified in detail during contract negotiations to ensure that the request adheres to Board regulations governing payment of salary. Full funding is recommended, provided the salary request is adequately documented. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: Foreign Language Lab On-line Testing and Training Enhancement

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    18    (of 20 points)  
B.3    21    (of 25 points)  
B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
B.6     4     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     X     No           

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

C.1     9     (of 12 points)

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

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

**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     X     No           

**G. Total Score**     83     (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:** Requested Amount:     \$68,335      
Recommended Amount:     \$55,275    

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 to create a multi-language online practice program is quite timely and based on a solid existing foundation. Based upon impressive growth patterns in most foreign languages taught at LSU, the PI proposes a well-documented (and partially tested) model of a cyberlab for interactive exercises and relevant picture, audio and video materials. The main purpose is to improve further the oral production focus of foreign language training and to maximize the number of active participants. Since the work of the two requested graduate teaching assistants will go beyond mere technical support, the panel suggests that they be encouraged to focus their M.A. theses on their contributions, including the new facilities' pedagogical applications. The panel believes, however, that Board funding should be provided for only one of the GTA positions. The university should support the second GTA, particularly given the minimal institutional match provided for this excellent project. In addition, funding for workshop meals should be provided by the university or another source. The panel recommends reduced funding of \$55,275. The institutional match should be maintained in full and, if possible, increased.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL  
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Shreveport

Title of Proposal: Workplace Technology in the Learning Environment

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes            No     X    

**H. Total Score** 78 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                   \$47,723  
 Recommended Amount:                   \$33,375

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 correct in asserting that developing functional writing skills, especially among college graduates, should be among the highest priorities for higher education institutions. In light of the well-documented presence of a large population of adult students at LSU-Shreveport, this proposal carries additional urgency. The panel believes, however, that the request for computers from the Support Fund is high; therefore, the panel recommends funding for twenty-five Dell PCs rather than the thirty requested. The institutional match is excellent and should be maintained in full.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL  
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana State University and A&M College – Shreveport

Title of Proposal: Foreign Language Laboratory Enhancement

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     3     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes     X     No           

**H. Total Score** 81 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$48,041  
Recommended Amount:                     \$48,041

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

The case for an overdue upgrade of teaching technology for foreign languages and associated programs at LSU-Shreveport is strongly made and written with very helpful and specific detail. Nevertheless, the instructional and curricular implications go well beyond the general outlines articulated in this proposal and could have been presented more forcefully. The proposed budget is modest, and funding at the requested level of \$48,041 is recommended. The institutional match is excellent and should be maintained.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015HUM-06**

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: Accepting the Challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Using Multimedia Technology to Enhance the Delivery of Writing and Literature Instruction at Louisiana Tech University

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**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** 70 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:           \$149,150            
 Recommended Amount:           \$50,407          

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 rationale and work plan of this proposal, which requests support for equipment upgrades for writing and literature instruction, are strongly presented. Its weakness is in the budget, which requests funds for an excessive number of faculty laptops (48), an instrument that has become standard equipment for most higher education instructors. Board of Regents funds should not be used to provide what is now standard equipment for individual faculty members across a department. The equipment requested for the classrooms, however, is necessary and well-chosen. The panel therefore recommends that classroom equipment be funded in full, and faculty laptops eliminated from the budget. Funding of \$50,407 is recommended. Institutional match for faculty release may be reduced in proportion to the funding reduction, but matching funds for classroom software should be maintained in full.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016HUM-06**

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

Title of Proposal: Enhancement of Instructional Technologies for Optimal Learning in Foreign Languages

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**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.)

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$71,779  
 Recommended Amount:                     \$64,445

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 builds on a solid foundation, which was partially established through previous Support Fund awards, and features an established outreach effort as well as a high level of creativity recognized by the administration. Apparently the program secures its own funds from small grants and receives neither a designated budget nor, surprisingly, any institutional match for this project. While the general goal and components are convincingly argued, there is some imprecision and needed details are missing. In particular, the budget lacks sufficient explanations, including per-item costs and a justification of the total project cost. These must be provided during contract negotiations. The panel recommends reduced funding for ten PCs, rather than the requested twelve, and a total award of \$64,445. In addition, the panel recommends that the award be contingent on Southern University providing a minimal institutional match of at least \$5,000 for foreign language software acquisition.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017HUM-06**

Institution: Tulane University

Title of Proposal: New Tools for Linguistic Research: Transcribed Corpora of Louisiana French

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1    12    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**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     X     No           

**G. Total Score**

75

 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	Requested Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$57,405   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$56,170*   </u>
	Recommended Amount:	Yr. 1 <u>   \$17,000   </u>	Yr. 2 <u>   \$17,000   </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.)

Several grants and substantial Board of Regents monies have been awarded in previous competitions to the PI's long-range project on Louisiana French. This additional two-year proposal expands in several new directions, requesting support for transcription of recordings, participation in international publication on French phonology, and a conference. While the many goals of this proposal are valid and the detailed work plan is impressive, the project does not seem cost-effective. In particular, the amounts requested for additional interviews (enhancing primarily the peripheral PFC project) and travel by two project PIs and keynote speakers are high and these activities are not shown to be likely to yield significant enhancement. The panel recommends funding for one graduate research assistant whose sole task will be to transcribe the existing corpus of linguistic data. Thus, an award of \$17,000 per year for two years is recommended. Institutional match may be reduced in proportion to the budget reduction, but full tuition support for the graduate assistant must be maintained.

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

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS  
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018HUM-06**

Institution: University of New Orleans

Title of Proposal: Urban Communities in Sea-Land: Flood Works Technology in International  
Historical Perspective

**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)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1     9     (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     7     (For NS/NE)

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     2     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes     X     No           

**G. Total Score**

67 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Requested Amount:                     \$67,475  
 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.)

In the aftermath Hurricane Katrina it is natural for scholars to scramble to see how their disciplines can contribute to the discussion, and history deserves a central place at the table. However, the goals of this proposal seem too diffuse and ill-defined to merit support. The benefits of an expensive research project in the Netherlands beyond the production of a journal article are not clearly articulated or easily intuited. In addition, the impact of the research could be limited due to its reliance largely on secondary sources. This also suggests that many of the research materials could be obtained through interlibrary loan or electronic means, and the expensive travel eliminated. The Floodworks Technology Special Collection element of the proposal needs substantial additional development for funding to be recommended. It is not clear how the rather limited projects outlined in this proposal would help establish UNO as a leader in research and education on the history of this technology. No funding is recommended.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED**

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Traditional Enhancement Program - Humanities  
for the FY 2005-2006 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>001HUM-06 HUM</b>	Giving Reasons: Fostering Ethical Discussion in Northwest Louisiana	Centenary College (Philosophy);	Christopher Ciocchetti; Michael Futreal; Scott Chirhart;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> .	<b>\$ 32,515</b> <b>61,800*</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 94,315</b>
N	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>002HUM-06 HUM</b>	The Francophone Heritage of Louisiana: The Compilation of a Corpus of Early Louisiana French Correspondence	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for French and Francophone Studies);	Bernard Cerquiglini; Elaine Smyth;	<b>1</b> .	<b>\$ 17,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 17,000</b>
N	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

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

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

<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>003HUM-06 HUM</b>	The Southern Women Authors Project	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (English);	Katherine R. Henninger;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 49,860</b> <b>\$ 18,980</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 68,840</b>
N	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>004HUM-06 HUM</b>	Cajun and Creole on the Web: Online Courses for Louisiana's Heritage Languages	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (French Studies);	Amanda LaFleur;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 39,340</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 39,340</b>
N	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>005HUM-06 HUM</b>	Beyond Conversion and Syncretism: Indigenous Encounters with Missionary Christianity. An International Conference To Be Held at LSU	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (History);	David Lindenfeld; Miles Richardson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 33,174</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,174</b>
N	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>006HUM-06 HUM</b>	Proposal to Enhance the Program in Louisiana and Caribbean Studies at Louisiana State University	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (English);	John Lowe; Katherine Henninger; Paul E. Hoffman;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> .	<b>\$ 53,100</b> <b>\$ 53,100*</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 106,200</b>
N Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>007HUM-06 HUM</b>	Early English Books Online	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (English);	Susannah B. Monta;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> .	<b>\$ 186,760</b> <b>\$ 33,098</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 219,858</b>
N Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>008HUM-06 HUM</b>	Writing Teacher Training and On-line Book Development Lab	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (English);	Irvin Peckham;	<b>1</b> .	<b>\$ 53,966</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 53,966</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>009HUM-06 HUM</b>	Archival Storage and On-Line Collection Access for Instruction and Public Outreach at the LSU Textile and Costume Museum	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Human Ecology);	Pamela P. Rabalais; Jenna T. Kuttruff;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 78,073</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 78,073</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>010HUM-06 HUM</b>	The Hispanic World: Current Trends in Hispanic Cultural Studies	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Foreign Languages and Literatures);	Joseph V. Ricapito; Christian F. Palacios;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 19,473</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,473</b>
<b>N</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>011HUM-06 HUM</b>	The Louisiana Shakespeare Project: Completing the First Stage	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (English);	Malcolm Richardson; Bainard Cowan; Susannah Monta;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 20,278</b> <b>\$ 35,198</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 55,476</b>
<b>N</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>012HUM-06 HUM</b>	Foreign Language Lab On-line Testing and Training Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Foreign Language Lab);	Andrew A. Tabor;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 68,335</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 68,335</b>
<b>N</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>013HUM-06 HUM</b>	Workplace Technology in the Learning Environment	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (English);	Merrell Knighten; Cleatta Morris;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 47,723</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 47,723</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>014HUM-06 HUM</b>	Foreign Language Laboratory Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Foreign Languages);	Lynn Walford; Cecilia Smith; Lillian Moskeland; Megan Conway;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 48,041</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 48,041</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>015HUM-06 HUM</b>	Accepting the Challenges of the 21st Century: Using Multimedia Technology to Enhance the Delivery of Writing and Literature Instruction at Louisiana Tech University	Louisiana Tech University (English);	Tamara Powell; Daniel Shockley; Jennifer Laufenberg; Susan Eller; William Willoughby;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 149,150</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 149,150</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>016HUM-06 HUM</b>	Enhancement of Instructional Technologies for Optimal Learning in Foreign Languages	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Foreign Languages);	Fatima Chajia; Linda Lassiter; Thomas Miller;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 71,779</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 71,779</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>017HUM-06 HUM</b>	New Tools for Linguistic Research: Transcribed Corpora of Louisiana French	Tulane University (French and Italian);	Thomas A. Klingler;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 57,405</b> <b>\$ 56,170*</b>
<b>N</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 113,575</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

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

<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>018HUM-06 HUM</b>	Urban Communities in Sea-Land: Flood Works Technology in International Historical Perspective	University of New Orleans (History);	Andrew Goss; Arnold Hirsch; Connie Atkinson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 67,475</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 67,475</b>

N  
 Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Humanities for the FY 2005-2006 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>
<b>18</b>	<b>\$ 1,093,447</b>	<b>\$ 1,351,793</b>	<b>\$</b>

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS**

#### Form 6.11

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals  
Primarily Requesting Equipment

#### Form 6.12

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals  
Primarily Requesting Non-Equipment Related Support  
(e.g., Curricular Revisions, Colloquia)

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES \_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_ 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 a 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:

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

\_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts. F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_ G.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

Requested Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Recommended Amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2005-06  
 RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points**

- |                    |     |  |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| YES _____ NO _____ | 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 a 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:

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: \_\_\_\_\_