

2007-08 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

Mathematics

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. David Smith, Chair, Duke University; and Dr. William C. Bauldry, Appalachian State University, met in Baton Rouge on February 1, 2008 for the purpose of evaluating seventeen (17) Mathematics 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) seventeen (17) Mathematics proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2007-08 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2005 Traditional Enhancement Report in Mathematics.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the seventeen proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two 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 70. 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 \$1,633,647 were submitted to the panel, which then recommended first-year awards totaling \$497,752 for five (5) proposals, with an additional \$80,000 recommended for two (2) proposals if additional funds become available.

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	93	011MATH-08	NSU	\$117,143	\$112,993	\$0	\$0
2	92	003MATH-08	LSUBR	\$170,739	\$140,000	\$16,919	\$0
3	85	016MATH-08	ULL	\$80,359	\$80,359	\$0	\$0
4	83	008MATH-08	LSUBR	\$169,348	\$135,400	\$27,600	\$14,600
5	82	005MATH-08	LSUBR	\$54,550	\$29,000	\$46,000	\$21,000
TOTALS:				\$592,139	\$497,752	\$90,519	\$35,600

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
6	72	001MATH-08	CEN	\$81,177	\$70,000	\$0	\$0
7	70	017MATH-08	UNO	\$13,701	\$10,000	\$13,701	\$10,000
TOTALS:				\$94,878	\$80,000	\$13,701	\$10,000

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
8	60	006MATH-08	LSU-BR	\$73,120	\$0	\$26,600	\$0
9	59	009MATH-08	LSU-BR	\$244,671	\$0	\$50,000	\$0
10	58	007MATH-08	LSU-BR	\$96,080	\$0	\$44,600	\$0
11	53	013MATH-08	SU-BR	\$113,168	\$0	\$0	\$0
12	50	010MATH-08	LSU-S	\$21,168	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	41	002MATH-08	Dillard	\$237,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
13	41	004MATH-08	LSU-BR	\$42,000	\$0	\$42,000	\$0
15	30	015MATH-08	Tulane	\$99,497	\$0	\$51,786	\$0
16	28	012MATH-08	SU-BR	\$6,549	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	23	014MATH-08	SU-BR	\$13,377	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$946,630	\$0	\$214,986	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MATH-08

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Broadening Technology Access for Calculus and Precalculus

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katherine Brandl

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (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 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (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: \$81,177
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

The panel questions the need for a one-to-one laptop-to-student ratio, or the need for laptops rather than PCs. However, the authors do provide an articulate rationale for these issues and the panel recommends partial funding of \$70,000 if additional funds become available. Student laptops can be acquired for less than the quoted price and the panel does not recommend funding for ten extra batteries. Other reductions may be made at the principal investigator's discretion. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MATH-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement Mathematics Instruction and Research (MIR-II)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Frempong-Mireku

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 41 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 0 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 4 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$237,000
 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 has problems on many levels. It does not address the pedagogical issues it proposes to attack. The return on investment per student appears to be very low. There is no evidence offered that the related Support Fund equipment grant awarded during the last cycle has produced measurable success. The proposed equipment list does not make sense given the stated goals of the project. Given the size of the equipment request, a detailed maintenance plan needs to be provided. Finally, the spelling, grammar, and style make this proposal very difficult to read. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Human Resource Development in Mathematical Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Scott Baldrige

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 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 18 (of 20 points)
 B.3 20 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (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: 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>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$170,739</u>	<u>\$16,919</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$140,000</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 a well-designed project that addresses a critical situation. Given the size of the request and the realities of the current funding cycle, the panel recommends partial funding of \$140,000 in year one and feels the university should consider funding the remainder. Reductions are to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The panel recommends that this also be approached as a research project with careful collection and analysis of data and a view to applying for subsequent federal funding. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing LSU's Mathematics Graduate Program Through International Contacts

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marco Schlichting

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 41 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	\$42,000	\$42,000
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

This is described as a "new request", but the program has been funded by the Board of Regents Support Fund continuously for six years, including extensions. If LSU thinks the project is worthy, it is time for the university to find a way to fund it or for the department to look for different funding sources.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Students Professional Success

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lawrence Smolinsky

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 18 (of 20 points)
 B.3 18 (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 _____

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: 82 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	\$54,550	\$46,000
	Recommended Amount:	\$29,000	\$21,000

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

This is a good proposal, but it requests too many items that the university itself should fund, if they are that important. We suggest that Supplies and Colloquium funds be cut and the conference participation be funded at a level of \$20,000 per year. Partial funding is recommended in both years. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Undergraduate Research Experiences Program
(REU) in Mathematics Through External Collaboration

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Neal W. Stoltzfus

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)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

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: 60 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$73,120</u>	<u>\$26,600</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is described as a "new request", but this program has been funded continuously through the BoRSF (two-year grants extended to three years) except for one cycle since 1993. In particular, the 2004 proposal was very similar to the current one under review. We note that no results on attracting women and minorities to the program are reported. At any rate, the authors should now be able to find another funding source.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Geometry Visualization Laboratory in the Enhancement of the
Mathematical Research Program in Geometry and Topology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Neal W. Stoltzfus

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

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: 58 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	\$96,080	\$44,600
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

No evidence is offered that the proposed expenditures would directly enhance undergraduate or graduate education. Given that the regional conference is an "ongoing" endeavor, this forum is not the appropriate source for funding it. The travel request for visiting experts would be more compelling if the experts were named and had agreed to come. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Minority Recruiting and Mentoring in Mathematics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Tom

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 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 20 (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 _____

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: 83 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$169,348</u>	<u>\$27,600</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$135,400</u>	<u>\$14,600</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 panel is pleased to see that the principal investigators have used the small Support Fund grant from three years ago to do a pilot project and prepare a much more substantial proposal. The goals of the project are admirable and necessary for the department to become nationally competitive. An important aspect of the proposal is that it includes plans for programs to become self-sustaining. Because of budgetary restrictions and the number of competitive proposals, the resources are not available to fully fund the proposal, but the panel recommends that the university find additional resources to see that the project is carried out. Partial funding is recommended in both years of the project with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Applied Math at LSU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter R. Wolenski

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 20 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

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: 59 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$244,671</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

While applied math is an important area in modern academia that the department has certainly begun to address, this proposal has a number of apparently unrelated components that are not well justified individually. In section b.3, the evidence of potential to achieve eminence is not clearly described. Since the previously Board of Regents-funded Math Tune-Up has subsequently been funded by the university, that should continue. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Instruction by Upgrading Classroom Equipment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Deborah K. Shepherd

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)

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

H. Total Score: 50 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (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: \$21,168
 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 directed at "teaching" and not at all at "learning". It assumes without evidence that students taught in a high-tech classroom will learn more than those who are not. Because the department already has two Board of Regents-funded high-tech classrooms, the principal investigators could have done a study to find this evidence. However, they would likely discover no significant difference. The proposal shows no recognition of the fact that time and effort on the part of the faculty are required in order to make effective use of technology. The proposal claims to impact every student at LSU-S, but the panel wonders about the ones taught in the other four classrooms. The proposal would make more sense if the university were offering to equip those four rooms and asking the Board of Regents to fund three. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MATH-08

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mathematics Experiences Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leigh Ann Myers

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: 93 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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:	<u>\$117,143</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$112,993</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 panel was impressed with the extent to which this department is aware of and adopts national recommendations for College Algebra. Two hands-on experiences per course is a modest but achievable goal. Hopefully, a successful outcome will lead to expanded activities in the future. The panel recommends partial funding. The RFP requires that training costs for in-house faculty are from matching funds rather than the Support Fund, and no funding is recommended for this item. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating TI-84 Graphing Calculators for Student and Faculty Use

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katrina Ashford Cunningham

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 28 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 0 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (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 3 (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:** \$6,549
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 department should be coordinating its proposals and agreeing on departmental goals. It is not clear that the department wants to go in the direction of calculators in the classroom and would support this project. The proposal offers no evidence that anyone will show up for the workshops. The project work plan is not well-defined. The proposal's objectives need to be quantifiable. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Mathematics Instruction, Research and Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joseph A. Meynsse

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 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 5 (of 15 points)
 B.3 5 (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 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

H. Total Score: 53 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$113,168
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 department should be coordinating its proposals and agreeing on departmental goals, and needs to come to consensus on its goals for using technology. In preparation for the next round of funding, the chair should lead a departmental discussion. It is not too early to start now to prepare for the 2010 competition. This proposal appears to lay the groundwork for a promising multidisciplinary project. The project is too vague to tell what specifically is proposed or how the authors will determine if the goals are realized. There are several items in the equipment list that are not accounted for in the narrative and it is unclear what their purpose is. Therefore, the budget appears to be excessive for the project. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014MATH-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Mathematics Department Laboratory
Through Computer Software

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Humberto Munoz

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 6 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 5 (of 20 points)
 B.3 0 (of 25 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

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: 23 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$13,377</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

The department should be coordinating its proposals and agreeing on departmental goals. This proposal does not provide a real plan for implementation or describe how the software will enhance the educational mission of the department. Assessment by comparing grades and conducting student surveys is not an acceptable mechanism for determining success. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015MATH-08

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Research Experiences for Undergraduates and Teachers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Morris Kalka

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 6 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 20 points)
 B.3 0 (of 25 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

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: 30 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	\$99,497	\$51,786*
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

The proposal seeks funds to replace funding lost from NSF to support the summer salary of the principal investigators (PIs). Both REU and RET are old ideas. The PIs propose a slightly different audience and a shorter project length. It is not clear that either program is really about research. The proposal offers no evidence to support the claimed impacts. In the best of all possible worlds, this project may produce one new student per year at Tulane. The panel does not understand how that justifies any expansion of the department or constitutes the best use of these funds. No funding is recommended.

*The RFP restricts 2nd-year requests to \$50,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016MATH-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening the Analytical Thinking and Mathematical Decision-Making Skills of Business Students in a Finite Mathematics Course

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Lopez

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

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	Requested Amount:	<u>\$80,359</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$80,359</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-designed proposal with a good implementation plan. It is very positive to see a co-principal investigator (PI) from the College of Business and the panel appreciates the cooperation with the client discipline. The panel recommends that the PI investigate the Thompson material from the MAA CRM series. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017MATH-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancemnet of Industry Oriented Statistical Education at
UNO: Post Katrina Years

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tumulesh K. S. Solanky

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____

A.2 5 (of 5 points)

A.3 3 (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)

D.2a 8 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

D.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 0 (of 5 points)

B.2 12 (of 20 points)

B.3 18 (of 25 points)

B.4 3 (of 5 points)

B.5 2 (of 2 points)

B.6 3 (of 5 points)

B.7 Yes _____ No x

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: 70 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$13,701</u>	<u>\$13,701</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>
		(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 would have benefited from having added details about the experts and industry contacts to be utilized in the project. The principal investigators need to use standard rates for student help and to recognize that ordinary secretarial duties are not appropriate expenses. The authors also need to pay careful attention to language and syntax in their exposition. However, the project is a reasonable idea at a critical juncture for the department and university, and partial funding is recommended in both years should funding become available. Reductions are to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator and the institutional match may be reduced proportionally.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MATH-08 MAT	Broadening Technology Access for Calculus and Precalculus	Centenary College (Mathematics);	Katherine Brandl; Chris Brandt; David Thomas; Mark Schlatter; Mark Goadrich;	1 .	\$ 81,177
				Total	\$ 81,177
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002MATH-08 MAT	Enhancement Mathematics Instruction and Research (MIR -II)	Dillard University (Mathematics/Computer Science);	Peter Frempong -Mireku; Haewon Lee; Hong Dai;	1 .	\$ 237,000
				Total	\$ 237,000
E					
Proposal is a Continuation Request					
Previous Contract: LEQSF(2005-06)-ENH-TR-04					

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003MATH-08 MAT	Human Resource Development in Mathematical Sciences	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Scott Baldrige; Frank Neubrandner; Jacek Cygan; James Madden; Lawrence Smolinsky; Nell McAnelly;	1 2 .	\$ 170,739 \$ 16,919 <hr/> \$ 187,658
N	Proposal is a New Request				
004MATH-08 MAT	Enhancing LSU's Mathematics Graduate Program Through International Contacts	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Marco Schlichting; Jerome W. Hoffman; Jorge Morales; Robert Perlis;	1 2 .	\$ 42,000 \$ 42,000 <hr/> \$ 84,000
N	Proposal is a New Request				
005MATH-08 MAT	Enhancing Students Professional Success	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Lawrence Smolinsky; G. Olafsson; Mark Davidson;	1 2 .	\$ 54,550 \$ 46,000 <hr/> \$ 100,550
N	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MATH-08 MAT	Enhancing Undergraduate Research Experiences Program (REU) in Mathematics Through External Collaboration	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Neal W. Stoltzfus; Jerome W. Hoffman; Robert V. Perlis;	1 2 .	\$ 73,120 \$ 26,600 <hr/> \$ 99,720
N	Proposal is a New Request				
007MATH-08 MAT	Geometry Visualization Laboratory in the Enhancement of the Mathematical Research Program in Geometry & Topology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Neal W. Stoltzfus; Dan C. Cohen; Oliver T. Dasbach;	1 2 .	\$ 96,080 \$ 44,600 <hr/> \$ 140,680
N	Proposal is a New Request				
008MATH-08 MAT	Minority Recruiting and Mentoring in Mathematics	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Michael Tom; Frank Neubrandner; Guillermo Ferreyra;	1 2 .	\$ 169,348 \$ 27,600 <hr/> \$ 196,948
N	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009MATH-08 MAT	Applied Math at LSU	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Peter R. Wolenski; Hui -Hsiung Kuo; Robert Lipton; Susanne C. Brenner;	1 2 .	\$ 244,671 \$ 50,000 <hr/> \$ 294,671
N Proposal is a New Request					
010MATH-08 MAT	Improving Instruction by Upgrading Classroom Equipment	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Mathematics);	Deborah K. Shepherd; Paul Sisson; Richard Mabry; Tibor Szarvas;	1 .	\$ 21,168 <hr/> \$ 21,168
E Proposal is a New Request					
011MATH-08 MAT	Mathematics Experiences Laboratory	Northwestern State University (Mathematics);	Leigh Ann Myers; Elizabeth Cole; Eric Fountain; Mary E. Reeves; Roxanne Lane;	1 .	\$ 117,143 <hr/> \$ 117,143
E Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012MATH-08 MAT	Integrating TI-84 Graphing Calculators for Student and Faculty Use	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Katrina Ashford Cunningham;	1	\$ 6,549
				Total	\$ 6,549
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
013MATH-08 MAT	Enhancement of Mathematics Instruction, Research and Learning	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Joseph A. Meyinsse; Dewitt Jones; Hamady Diop; Patricia E. McLean- Meyinsse;	1	\$ 113,168
				Total	\$ 113,168
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
014MATH-08 MAT	Enhancement of the Mathematics Department Laboratory Through Computer Software	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Humberto Munoz; Ingel Gwee;	1	\$ 13,377
				Total	\$ 13,377
N					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015MATH-08 MAT	Research Experiences for Undergraduates and Teachers	Tulane University (Mathematics);	Morris Kalka; Slawomir Kwasik;	1 2	\$ 99,497 \$ 51,786*
				Total	\$ 151,283
N	Proposal is a New Request				
016MATH-08 MAT	Strengthening the Analytical Thinking and Mathematical Decision -Making Skills of Business Students in a Finite Mathematics Course	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Mathematics);	Kathleen Lopez; Lee E. Price; Michael Totaro;	1	\$ 80,359
				Total	\$ 80,359
N	Proposal is a New Request				
017MATH-08 MAT	Enhancement of Industry Oriented Statistical Education at UNO: Post Katrina Years	University of New Orleans (Mathematics);	Tumulesh K. S. Solanky; Linxiong LI;	1 2	\$ 13,701 \$ 13,701
				Total	\$ 27,402
N	Proposal is a Continuation Request Previous Contract: LEQSF(2002-04)-ENH-TR-92				

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Math for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
17	\$ 1,633,647	\$ 1,952,853	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES _____ NO _____ A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES___ NO_____ G.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2007-08
 RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| YES _____ NO _____ | A.1 | Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)? |

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |

No Points Given,
But this is a required
component

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

COMMENTS:

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE--Total of 12 points

_____ of 12 pts

C.1 Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

COMMENTS:

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

_____ of 2 pts.

D.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either D.2a OR D.2b:

_____ of 10 pts.

D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

D.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES__ NO__

F.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____

Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____