

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

**REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN THE SPECIAL
MULTIDISCIPLINARY CATEGORY**

March 1, 2008

Prepared by:

P. Jonathan Patchett (Chair)
Professor, Geochemistry
University of Arizona

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
FY 2007-08**

Introduction

Thirty-two (32) Multidisciplinary Enhancement Program proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett of the University of Arizona. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for competition, including Business, Chemistry, Education, Mathematics, and Physics/Astronomy, and distributed to five subject-area reviewers. Total funding requested was \$3,698,622, with \$3,549,925 of that amount requested in first-year funds.

Dr. Patchett received the following materials for review: (a) the thirty-two (32) proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, etc.; (c) the FY 2007-08 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and (d) thirty-two (32) rating forms.

The subject-area reviews were submitted to Dr. Patchett electronically for further review and funding decisions. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and \$900,998 in first-year funds was recommended for ten (10) proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding. Table III contains a list of proposals deemed ineligible by the subject-area reviewers and the panel chair.

The reviewers and the panel chair noticed an inordinate number of proposals in this year's competition that either did not include one of the five eligible root disciplines or did not fit program guidelines. The RFP states in bold, underlined print, under "Eligibility Considerations" on page three that "Proposals submitted within the 'special multidisciplinary' category must include at least ONE of the disciplines eligible in this funding cycle." While each of the ineligible proposals were marked on the cover page as being rooted in one of the five eligible disciplines, the panel chair, in agreement with the subject-area reviewers, found that these proposals did not provide adequate proof that the project would enhance the study of the specific root discipline at the institution. Because of the difficulty in fairly rating what were often otherwise quality projects, these proposals were given no score and listed in Table III.

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.

MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT, FY 2007-08

SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS

Dr. Ernest R. Moser, University of Tennessee-Martin	Business
Dr. Sheila Ewing Browne, Mount Holyoke College	Chemistry
Dr. Kathleen Brown, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Education
Dr. David Smith, Duke University	Mathematics
Dr. Laurie McNeil, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Physics/Astronomy

**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	96	014MUL-08	LaTech	\$64,656	\$64,656		
2	95	032MUL-08	UNO	\$177,988	\$169,988		
3	94	018MUL-08	Nicholls	\$53,390	\$45,850		
4	93	006MUL-08	LSUBR	\$248,150	\$243,150	\$0	\$0
4	93	016MUL-08	LaTech	\$85,238	\$85,238		
6	89	019MUL-08	Nicholls	\$65,580	\$65,580		
7	88	008MUL-08	LSUBR	\$148,840	\$91,336	\$49,000	\$49,000
7	88	010MUL-08	LSUBR	\$42,650	\$40,650		
7	88	017MUL-08	LaTech	\$58,500	\$50,000		
10	87	012MUL-08	LSUS	\$71,496	\$44,550		
TOTALS:				\$1,016,488	\$900,998	\$49,000	\$49,000

**TABLE II
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
11	85	009MUL-08	LSUBR	\$200,837	\$0		
12	84	011MUL-08	LSUBR	\$91,000	\$0		
13	82	021MUL-08	SUBR	\$190,000	\$0		
14	78	003MUL-08	Dillard	\$175,570	\$0		
14	78	004MUL-08	LSUBR	\$217,092	\$0		
16	76	022MUL-08	SUBR	\$36,605	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	69	005MUL-08	LSUBR	\$108,342	\$0	\$49,924	\$0
18	68	027MUL-08	SUNO	\$10,570	\$0		
19	65	001MUL-08	Dillard	\$88,375	\$0		
19	65	030MUL-08	ULL	\$81,100	\$0		
21	62	023MUL-08	SUBR	\$89,600	\$0	\$0	\$0
22	60	031MUL-08	ULL	\$210,880	\$0		
23	53	026MUL-08	SUNO	\$63,100	\$0		
24	50	028MUL-08	SUNO	\$53,230	\$0		
25	45	024MUL-08	SUBR	\$182,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$1,798,501	\$0	\$49,924	\$0

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS CONSIDERED INELIGIBLE**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
	no score	002MUL-08	Dillard	\$41,519	\$0		
	no score	007MUL-08	LSUBR	\$200,000	\$0		
	no score	013MUL-08	LSUS	\$108,380	\$0		
	no score	015MUL-08	LaTech	\$45,000	\$0		
	no score	020MUL-08	SLU	\$94,834	\$0	\$49,773	\$0
	no score	025MUL-08	SUNO	\$112,083	\$0		
	no score	029MUL-08	ULL	\$133,120	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$734,936	\$0	\$49,773	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of STEM Learning and Tutoring Center in the
Division of Natural Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Abdalla Darwish

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 1 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$88,375
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 poorly prepared and full of grammatical and typographical errors. The project summary page appears to be from a different proposal. The stated intent of the project is to increase the number of STEM students and improve instruction and research training by the use of graphing calculators, computers, smartboards, a projector, and a video encyclopedia. The authors claim that this equipment will also be used in faculty and student research. However, apart from the projector (to be used to practice PowerPoint presentations), no indication is given anywhere in the proposal of what use will be made of this equipment (especially in research) and how that will benefit students. Instead of stating specific, measurable goals for the project, the proposal provides a list of activities at the Learning and Tutoring Center. A minor, vague attempt is made to relate the equipment to be purchased to those activities, but it is not sufficient to be convincing. Stating that "activities of the faculty will be enhanced" and thus Dillard "will be recognized more in all the STEM fields" without any description of how this would come about is not adequate to show potential to achieve eminence. No indication is given of how the equipment "will give the faculty the opportunity to participate in developing more research projects." Without a specific set of activities that require (or would clearly be enhanced by) the use of the equipment requested, it is impossible to evaluate whether or not the proposal's intent is likely to be achieved. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Integrative Teaching and Learning:
BEM Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jose Ramirez-Domenech

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

no score

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$41,519
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 should not be considered eligible this year because it is primarily biology, with minimal involvement from mathematics. In particular, there was no instructional involvement from the mathematics department. The mathematical contribution is limited to inserting some activities on graphing and data analysis, but nothing on other modeling ideas that could be useful in the biological subjects under study. The timeline for development and implementation of materials is inadequate. Furthermore, the authors checked "not primarily equipment", but the entire request is for equipment. The only positive result of funding would be that the institution would have 24 more computers than it has now. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project Teach Chemistry

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Reginald Stanton

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 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (of 20 points)
B.3 18 (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 1 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$175,570
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal aims to use an inquiry-based instruction approach to facilitate and enhance learner outcomes for chemistry majors enrolled in Chemistry Seminar I (fall semester), while simultaneously offering professional development opportunities for uncertified chemistry teachers in two of the public school districts in New Orleans and the surrounding districts. Project goals and objectives are pertinent, relevant, and well-defined. The work plan is interesting, well-described and sufficiently detailed. This project will indeed create and nurture an authentic community of learning between university professors, college students, high school teachers and high school students. However, it seems unlikely that anyone could "master" content knowledge and pedagogical skills in six class sessions in the fall and three weeks in the summer. This appears overly optimistic and the researchers should have stated this language a little more realistically. The authors also need to do a better job of defining measurable outcomes, especially for the summer bridge program. The principal investigator should look for more avenues of support (e.g., financial, supplies, human) with industrial sponsors and connect this project to economic development in the area. Because of financial restrictions and the number of competitive proposals, no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collaborative Communications and Webcasting Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kelly Blessinger

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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 RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$217,092
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks funds for renovating an out-of-date classroom in the LSU-BR Library and converting it into a webcasting (and advanced technology) room. The proposal is very well written, well documented, with detailed cost estimates, but does not really fit directly into any of the single disciplines listed in the RFP. How it will benefit economic development is uncertain, other than in general. All faculty and staff listed were in the library so, although there were letters of support from a variety of fields, the proposal did not demonstrate how any area would use the facility for economic/cultural impact. The proposal is far too ambitious (and very expensive) and would be better approached in stages or with a much larger institutional match for the renovation and supplies. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Developing Optimal Extraction Paths for an Aquifer Shared by Two States under Alternative Regulatory Scenarios

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ricardo Estrada

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)
 D.2a 9 (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 8 (of 20 points)
 B.3 15 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (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: 69 (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>\$108,342</u>	<u>\$49,924</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal does not conform very well to the instructions for preparation. There is no work plan to speak of, and it can only be inferred from the budget who will do what and when. On the plus side, there is an extensive mathematical discussion of the approaches that will be taken to an important problem. Not all of the mathematical details make sense and may be marred by typos, but some positive things may come out of the proposed effort. The faculty personnel appear qualified to carry out the proposed work as far as their expertise extends, and the proposal describes the aquifer in a general way, but the addition of a hydrologist is needed. There are many detailed and localized hydrological and geological factors that govern groundwater extraction, particularly when (as here) competitive extraction on either side of jurisdictional boundaries is an issue. The budget figures appear to be reasonable, but the lack of any institutional commitment to the project is disappointing. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Super Conducting Quantum Interference
Device (SQUID) Magnetometer for Characterization of
Magnetic Nanomaterials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Challa S. Kumar

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 10 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	<u>\$248,150</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Requested Amount:	<u>\$248,150</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$243,150</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.)

The research that this proposal is intended to support is of very high quality and has significant potential for commercial application. Because the principal investigators are currently doing magnetic measurements based on results shown in the proposal, the argument would have been strengthened by stating where those measurements were made and how having an in-house facility would make a difference in the research outcomes as well as in the training of students. It is unclear in the work plan who will have responsibility for training users and scheduling user time. The institutional match is weak since the personnel are already engaged in this work independent of the acquisition of the instrument. The proposal would have benefited from more careful proofreading for typographical and grammatical errors. No funding is recommended for the liquid helium, and it is recommended that the principal investigators seek institutional support for this item. The proposal is recommended for partial funding. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU Campus Lake Restoration and Education Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charles W. Lindau

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____

A.2 _____ (of 5 points)

A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural

Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 2 points)

D.2a _____ (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

D.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 5 points)

B.2 _____ (of 20 points)

B.3 _____ (of 25 points)

B.4 _____ (of 5 points)

B.5 _____ (of 2 points)

B.6 _____ (of 5 points)

B.7 Yes _____ No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score: no score (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$200,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel notes that page 13 of the RFP (paragraph 6.c) states "Applicants should also note that the scope of the program does NOT permit: (1) construction of facilities". Page ii of this proposal states "A restored Campus Lake and construction of a 'LSU Living Wetland Laboratory' would benefit migratory birds, fish, and all other lake wildlife by improving habitats and water quality ... Board of Regents funds will also be used to help leverage private funds which will be used for dredging, designing and reconstruction of Campus Lake and construction of the LSU Living Wetland Laboratory. Funds requested from the Board of Regents Support Fund (\$200K) will be used for educational objectives (outreach, website, interactive educational center, signage and elevated research walkway)". \$175,000 of the \$200,000 requested is for Contracted Services and \$160,000 of that \$175,000 appears to be for construction of an Elevated Research Walkway and an Interactive Educational Center. While this is an interesting project, it does not fall within the allowable budgetary items for this RFP. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Professional Master's Degree Programs for K-12 STEM Teachers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Madden

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 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 1 (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 23 (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 _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$148,840</u>	<u>\$49,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$91,336</u>	<u>\$49,000</u>

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

This proposal aims to enhance graduate-level math, science, and education degree opportunities for practicing secondary teachers through the enhanced Master's of Natural Sciences (MNS) degree program and the new Master's of Education degree. It is well written and well conceptualized. The recruitment, retention, and renewal of the nation's mathematics and science teacher workforce are critically important issues. A need exists for more teachers who are properly trained and fully capable of delivering Advanced Placement courses. Although this group of researchers is experienced, caution on the speed with which they propose to implement the program is suggested. Consulting more public school personnel and industrial sponsors in the actual curriculum design and implementation would be beneficial. Teachers need to learn material that is extremely relevant to them, to their particular context, and to their students. Secondary teachers also need to see and experience great instructional methods as much as they need to grasp deep content knowledge. In this context, a minor disadvantage may be that the team appears to include only one educational specialist. The majority of the budget the first year (66%) is directed toward faculty salaries to work with a total of 12 to 24 students. It would be difficult/impossible to design and deliver such a

program without participation of several faculty members. Because of the restricted funds available and the number of competitive projects, it is recommended that the faculty salaries be funded at 40% of the requested amount. Even at 40% of the salary request, the funding still encompasses over \$38,000 of support for faculty salaries. It is recommended that funds for participants (\$48,000 each year) and for publications and supplies (total of \$6000) remain intact. The distribution of the funds within these guidelines is left to the discretion of the principal investigator. The panel hopes that LSU regards the proposal as important enough to increase support and keep this valuable educational program. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing School Data Accessibility and Utility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Mooney

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. 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 7 (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 23 (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 _____ No X

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:** \$53,230
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 goal of this project is to develop and pilot test user-friendly software that ties together multiple relevant school-based data sources. The rationale, goals, and objectives of this project are clear, concise, and on-target with current educational needs. The work plan is well conceptualized and thoroughly detailed. The two faculty members involved appear to have the expertise and connections needed to be successful. However, there are a few pertinent questions: 1) How do the authors know that LSU is the only institution of higher education engaged in such research and software development? 2) Who will the software developer be? This is an important question since 60% of the budget (\$120,000) is earmarked for this unknown. 3) What other institutional sponsors might be involved in the project and what other funding sources are available? 4) What impact will this project have on the development of other faculty members? Because of financial restrictions and the number of competitive proposals, no funding can be recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Metal Containing Diamond Like Carbon Deposition System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Varshni Singh

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$42,650
Recommended Amount: \$40,650

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.)

On the whole, this is a respectable proposal and worthy of funding. The justification of the purchase is most convincing with reference to solar cells, yet this research receives the least extensive discussion in the proposal. The need for *metal-doped* DLC films in the biomedical applications is not clear, although this item presumably provides justification for the project as multidisciplinary. The argument that adding equipment for metal doping to the existing DLC deposition facility will allow the biomedical research to achieve eminence is therefore weak. The performance measures (papers published, students engaged in research) could have been made more specific rather than stating that they "can not be estimated". It is recommended that the principal investigators seek institutional funds to cover the travel costs, so only partial funding is recommended. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Facilitating an Enhanced Linear Accelerator at the CAMD Synchrotron Light Source

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Victor Suller

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (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 _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$91,000
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 highly leveraged, since the most expensive components of the upgrade were received from J-lab. However, the justification for the upgrade is vague, other than the fact that the authors state that they can do it at low cost. No examples are given of experiments that would benefit from the increased intensity, or of experiments that are impossible to perform at the existing intensity and are therefore currently being done at another synchrotron or not at all. The number of synchrotron facilities in the United States is small enough that a direct comparison could have been made to demonstrate potential to achieve eminence. Much of the prose on impact refers to CAMD as a whole, and presumably applies independent of the upgrade. The increased attractiveness of CAMD to industrial researchers if the upgrade is made is also an aspiration rather than well supported ("the increased beam intensity...will surely increase the attractiveness and status of the CAMD facility to researchers") and would have been more convincing if an example of an experiment that would otherwise have been done at another facility were mentioned. There is no reason why specific price information could not have been included in the proposal, since the components needed are largely standard. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Multidisciplinary Animation, Film and Graphics Technology to Promote Economic Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jason Mackowiak

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$71,496
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$44,550

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

This proposal seeks funds to build on LSU-S's existing expertise in graphic design technology to enhance animation and digital video editing through the acquisition of state-of-the-art workstations, software and related peripherals. It is well thought out and explained, enhances what is already an institutional strength and is, therefore, quite reasonable. The proposal is described in the context of the already large film industry in northwest Louisiana. The proposal contains excellent existing and proposed partnerships, combined with a number of proposed private projects. While a good interdisciplinary team of faculty is assembled for the project, additional business faculty would have strengthened the proposal. The proposal would have also been strengthened if more details were included in the faculty and staff expertise section. LSU-S helpfully divided the request into Priority 1 hardware and software (\$44,550) and Priority 2 hardware and software (\$26,946). Due to budgetary restrictions, funding at the level of \$44,550 is recommended, which should not seriously impact the ability of the authors to accomplish project goals. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Learning by Constructing Models in a Virtual World

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Sigle

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

H. Total Score: no score (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$108,380
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.)

While this is a strong proposal, it is not eligible for this competition. The subject matter is almost entirely computer science, which is not eligible until next year. One of the co-principal investigators (co-PIs) teaches physics, but there is no development of specific physics content. The word "mathematics" does not appear anywhere (except in the PI's vitae). It is possible to imagine uses of the proposed lab for teaching and learning mathematics, but there is no evidence of contact with the mathematics department. Too little time and effort are allocated to development of learning materials, and none of the projected content is spelled out. Further, the development and subsequent use are largely left in the hands of unspecified (and uncompensated) "College of Sciences faculty", none of whom will have any incentive to substitute this activity for whatever they currently consider most important. It is not recommended that this proposal be funded in this cycle, but the authors are encouraged to resubmit next year, with emphasis on the benefits for computer science.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: H-DIML: High-speed Digital Imaging and Modeling Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark A. DeCoster

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

96

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$64,656
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$64,656

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

This is an outstanding example of a truly interdisciplinary project that will benefit both mathematics and biomedical engineering and enhance connections between the two. Mathematical modeling of neural systems is a very important area, and the requested equipment will enhance other facilities currently available on campus. The institutional commitment is strong, and this grant will support a well-documented need. The bulk of the funding request is for a single piece of equipment. The proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nanotechnology Lab Enhancement for Pharmaceutical Nanoparticle Manufacture Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: D. Patrick O'Neal

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: no score (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$45,000
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 is well written and clearly multidisciplinary, but between the disciplines of biomedical engineering, pharmacy and biology. Chemistry or any other discipline eligible in this competition is not properly represented. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Incorporation of Nano-scale Surface Characterization Techniques into LA Tech Chemistry/Physics Integrated Labs

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Upali Siriwardane

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 10 (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 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$85,238
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$85,238

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 requesting \$85,238 for the purchase of a new atomic force/scanning probe microscope (AFM/SPM). This is an excellent proposal for an instrument which will be used by physics, materials sciences and chemistry. The organization of the curriculum and the APMS lab (chemistry, physics, and materials sciences) are currently functioning to maximize the multidisciplinary use of the instrumentation and to optimize the cost effectiveness of the instrument. The principal investigators (PIs) who are in chemistry and physics have well thought out plans to use this instrument in courses and in research in chemistry, physics and engineering. The only weakness of the proposal is the institution's matching funds. The substantive institutional match is \$1,500 for a computer and a desk. Using indirect costs as matching funds or counting 20% of the PIs' nine-month salary as a match for the grant is much less than expected. The proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Multidiscipline Product Development and Marketing Through Modern Fabrication Tools

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heath Tims

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (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 _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$58,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

The proposal seeks funds to enhance equipment for use in product development (prototyping, fabrication, and marketing of new products). It is well thought out and has an interdisciplinary group of principal investigators who are experienced and well qualified. Funding the proposal will enhance the already strong relationship between the Colleges of Engineering and Business by providing state-of-the-art (and much safer) equipment for student entrepreneurs interested in developing and marketing a new product. A recently renovated laboratory/classroom is already available for the project, so the entire funding request is for equipment. There is no doubt of the economic impact funding the proposal will have as north Louisiana attempts to become more technologically and entrepreneurially savvy. Partial funding for the project is recommended. It appears that items 1-4 of the budget justification (\$50,000 total) will provide virtually the same impact as funding the entire project. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Honors Experience for Sciences Students at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John P. Doucet

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

94

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 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: \$53,390
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$45,850

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 for the enhancement of facilities for high-achieving students at Nicholls State. This is clearly a worthy goal, and up-to-date computers and projection equipment will certainly benefit the honors program. However, the proposal does not clearly describe the need for the archiving equipment or the kinds of materials to be preserved. Presumably much of it (honors theses, PowerPoint or video presentations, etc.) was originally produced in electronic form and can simply be burned on a CD or DVD. If the material exists in paper form, it can be photocopied. Scanning would be needed if older work needs to be electronically archived, but this need is not convincingly argued. It is also unclear why the DVD player is needed, what DVDs science students need to see, or if there are viewing facilities available in the library. Examples of the work students have produced would have made the case more convincing. This proposal is recommended for partial funding. However, in view of the numbers of equipment units requested (5 LCD projectors, 2 DVD players, 3 digital cameras, 7 desktops, 3 laptops, 2 movie cameras), with some units specified simply "for travel", it seems that the enhancement could have almost the same impact with a slightly reduced budget, with changes to be determined by the principal investigator. Institutional and private matches must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Optimizing Education and Research Transfer with Upgraded Presentation Tools

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary J. LaFleur

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$65,580
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$65,580

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 principal investigators (PIs) want to share their academic work by purchasing equipment that will allow them to increase their outreach efforts through hosting research conferences, making presentations at other institutions and local schools, and exhibiting their work at community gatherings and festivals. To fulfill these objectives, the proposal seeks funds to purchase 100 portable carpet-board panels and a poster laminator plus two notebook computers, two LCD projectors, two DVD players with speakers, and two digital cameras. This is a well-written proposal detailing very clear goals, objectives, work plans, timelines, and evaluation ideas. The equipment requests are specific and the faculty members involved have the necessary expertise. The economic and cultural impact section of the proposal is a little weak. Local impact is obvious, but it is recommended that the PIs think about larger, broader effects beyond the university and the immediate Thibodaux area. Additional funding sources could be explored. To a lesser degree, in the Enhancement Plan section, more details could have been provided concerning particular school visits, specific conferences and festivals, actual instructional methods, and teacher preparation issues. In spite of these minor concerns, the proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Computer Applications in Humanities Scholarship and the Teaching of Writing, Publishing and Professional Writing

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Hanson

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score: no score (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:	\$94,834	\$49,773
	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.)

While this is a strong proposal, it is not eligible for this competition. If it were not for the fact that the ISAT program is housed in mathematics, this proposal would have little or nothing to do with mathematics. Its major thrust is a collaboration between english and computer science. There are reasons of timing and scheduling based on work already done that make this an appropriate year from the principal investigator's point of view to seek funding, but it is not recommended that this proposal be funded in this cycle. The authors are encouraged to resubmit next year, with emphasis on the benefits for computer science. The proposal has something of a split personality, with its primary emphasis on online scholarly databases, and distinctly secondary attention to technical writing education for science and math students and pre-service training for English teachers. There does not seem to be any *a priori* reason why these different foci cannot be addressed simultaneously. It appears that a lot of useful work is being proposed for a modest amount of money.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Pulsed Laser Deposition (PLD) System for Nanoionic and Nanodielectric Thin Film Material Research at SUBR

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rambabu Bobba

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$190,000
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.)

The proposal requests funds for the acquisition of equipment that is certainly worthwhile, and it is indeed difficult to advance a program without in-house materials fabrication capability. However, the authors need to read the RFP more carefully. Sections A.2 and A.3 are not present in the proposal. Much of the work plan appears to be lifted from other proposals and does not bear specifically on the activities for this project, and no benchmarks are provided. It is unclear if a single pulsed laser deposition (PLD) system will be able to fabricate all of the materials discussed. It is also unclear what characteristics (wavelength, power) are needed or how they compare to the systems outside the university used by the researchers so far. The description of the potential to achieve eminence is extremely general and vague. It is unclear what, specifically, the PLD will provide that will improve the institution's standing or what it would contribute toward faculty development besides "provide a hope". The roles of Drs. Guo and Reese in the project as described are tenuous at best. All of these factors add up to a poor proposal for a good project. Supplies should be paid for by the grants funding the research for which the PLD will be used. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Brunauer, Emmett, and Teller (BET)
Surface Area Analyzer Capabilities for Research and Teaching
at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 76 (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:	\$36,605	\$0
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 proposal is requesting funds for the purchase of a Brunauer, Emmet, and Teller (BET) Surface Area Analyzer. There is no matching support from the institution. The enthusiasm and energy of Dr. Walker should be commended in writing several proposals. The Surface Area Analyzer would be used by both students and faculty in chemistry and in mechanical engineering. Though the proposal states that "faculty will be encouraged to incorporate this analytical tool into the classroom and laboratory instruction", it is not clear what impact the instrument will have on courses. A list of classes is provided "that will benefit from this project", only one of which is in chemistry. No mention is made of possible experiments. The proposal would be much stronger in every category if it were more specific. Cutting and pasting from one proposal to another excessively can eventually lead to a generic proposal and these are less likely to be funded. Care should be taken in editing the proposal. Using an institutional screening committee would help to prioritize the needs of students and faculty in the institution and in the departments. Because of financial restrictions and the number of competitive proposals, no funding is recommended.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of High Resolution Imaging Plate for XRD
Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No _____

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY
RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Requested
Amount:**
**Recommended
Amount:**

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
Requested Amount:	\$89,600	\$0
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 for the acquisition of an imaging plate guinier camera attachment for the x-ray powder diffractometer. There is no matching support from the institution. While the enthusiasm and energy of the principal investigator (PI) should be commended in writing several proposals, more care should be taken in composition and editing. Cutting and pasting from one proposal to another excessively can eventually lead to a generic proposal and make it less convincing. The research statement is word for word the same as in another proposal from the PI for a BET surface area analyzer. The proposal would be much stronger in every category if it were more specific. The authors do not make a strong case for the impact of this instrument on research or courses. The enhancement plan section does not adequately relate activities to goals and objectives. It is not clearly stated how the proposed equipment would enable research which cannot be done with the recently purchased x-ray powder diffractometer. No funding or biographical information was submitted for Co-PIs, and the potential impact of the project on their research is poorly described. An institutional screening committee would help to prioritize the needs of students and faculty in the institution and in the departments. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024MUL-08

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Renewable Fuels Laboratory for Sustainable Energy Education at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 45 (of 100 points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 1 (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 0 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (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 _____

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount:
Recommended Amount:

YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<u>\$182,200</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal is requesting funds for the acquisition of 17 instruments for the establishment of a renewable fuels laboratory for sustainable energy education. There are no matching funds from the institution. There is no indication that the faculty involved possess the necessary background for developing this project. The connection of the creation of this facility with the departments, curriculum and research is poorly described. The principal investigators (PIs) do not make a strong case for the impact of this facility on research or courses. The Co-PI did not submit funding or biographical information. The PI has submitted three multidisciplinary and three chemistry proposals in traditional enhancement. An institutional screening committee would help prioritize university and faculty needs. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Access of Minority Students to Biochemical and Genomics Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Solomon Adekulne

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes _____ No _____

A.2 _____ (of 5 points)

A.3 _____ (of 5 points)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 2 points)

D.2a _____ (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

D.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 5 points)

B.2 _____ (of 20 points)

B.3 _____ (of 25 points)

B.4 _____ (of 5 points)

B.5 _____ (of 2 points)

B.6 _____ (of 5 points)

B.7 Yes _____ No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 _____ (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

G. Total Score:

no score

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,083
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 requesting \$112,083 for the purchase of a LI-COR 4300 L Package for DNA sequencing. This proposal is not multidisciplinary with chemistry. It appears to be more suitable for submission under biology, but the proposal needs work. The proposal sections (A) The Current Situation and (B) Enhancement Plan were very weak. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Research Foundations and Development of Colleges of Business and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Alijani

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

53

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$63,100
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal is designed to increase the amount and quality of research by faculty in the Colleges of Business and Education. Unfortunately, it is very sketchy regarding how that would be accomplished and is not well thought out. It is also unclear how the development of a new "Smart" classroom with a 60-inch TV will enhance faculty research (and especially faculty research that would be more community-based). The experiences of only four of the five principal investigators were discussed in the narrative. Almost 1/3 of the budget is for student worker support and personnel training (the latter is not allowed under the RFP). The four objectives of the proposal to provide publication/writing workshops, to develop research plans for individual faculty in two colleges, to incorporate research into the colleges' curricula and the local community, and to develop an education and business research model linking research findings to community applications seem to have nothing to do with the equipment request that makes up the bulk of the proposal. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhanced Online Speech 210 Course

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lora Helvie-Mason

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$10,570
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 purpose of this project is to develop and deliver the Speech 210 course online through synchronous and asynchronous technologies. While acknowledging the need to enhance and enrich courses with such strategies, this proposal provides more questions than answers. Was a needs assessment conducted prior to developing this, or any other, online course? What other online courses are available and what instructional methods do they use? Why is synchronous and asynchronous instruction so important for Speech 210? Why is online speech instruction significant? Is Speech 210 a required course? How many students are involved? What is the purpose and what are the details surrounding the teacher workshop (i.e., Who? When? Where? How? and, most importantly, Why?)? What are the measurable outcomes of this project (e.g., student formative and summative feedback is vague)? The principal investigators do not adequately describe the need and/or the rationale behind this proposal. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028MUL-08

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Curricula Enhancement with Hands-on Applications in History and Science Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Linda Hill

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 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 5 (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 1 (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 _____ No X

G. Total Score: 50 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,230
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 project involves student training (with ten undergraduate and graduate students) and hands-on pedagogical applications involving the preservation and conservation of African Artifacts that were submerged in Hurricane Katrina's flood waters for over four weeks. While this is an important and necessary task, the principal investigator did not make a strong enough case for funding. The significance of this work and its direct connection to curricula content areas, to specific courses and instructional methods, to faculty and student development, and to multidisciplinary departments are missing from the proposal. As a result, evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is also absent. In addition, the actual work plan lacks detail, performance measures are omitted, and the description of how this project will promote economic development and/or cultural resources is unclear. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029MUL-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrated Environmental Engineering, Chemical Engineering and Environmental Science, and Mercury Emissions Control Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Daniel Dianchen Gang

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: no score (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 _____ (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$133,120
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 requesting \$133,120 for the purchase of a Total Mercury Monitoring System and Millennium Merlin system for mercury analysis. This proposal is not multidisciplinary with chemistry. There is no chemistry professor listed as a co-principal investigator. The proposal clearly belongs in engineering or multidisciplinary engineering. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030MUL-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nanotechnology System for Enhancing Chemical and Science Technology Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: G. H. Massiha

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

65

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (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 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$81,100
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 requesting \$81,100 to redesign and set up a basic introductory nanotechnology laboratory for use in laboratory courses with the acquisition of a molecular imager and a basic STM package. The institution is contributing \$15,400 in cash. One of the authors is from the industrial technology department and the other is from the chemistry department. This project is convincing neither in its impact on the curriculum or on research. While it appears to be a proposal for nanobiotechnology that was revamped to include chemistry, the chemistry connection is not clearly made. For example, in the section concerning impact on faculty development, the proposal states "Dr. Xu's research in electron transfer is directly impacted with the use of the requested equipment, see Dr. Xu's list of publications". Dr. Xu, an assistant professor in the chemistry department, has a Ph.D. in bioinformatics and computational biology, and his research is on the mechanisms by which signal transduction pathways and gene regulation control cell growth, proliferation, differentiation, death and disease. No funding is recommended for this proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031MUL-08

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Confocal Scanning Laser Microscope to Support Teaching and Research of Drug Delivery Systems, Polymer/Tissue Compatibility, and Hydration Inhibited Auto-fluorescence

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. D. K. Misra

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 0 (of 5 points)
A.3 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 5 (of 20 points)
B.4 0 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

60

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$210,880
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 requesting \$210,880 to purchase a confocal scanning microscope, and the institution is contributing \$20,000 in cash. It is truly multidisciplinary, as the departments of chemical engineering, chemistry and biology are represented in the proposal. The principal investigators (PIs) already have a published record of successful multidisciplinary collaboration. However, it is a concern that the entire proposal, and in particular in section C.3, Equipment on Hand for the Project, fails to mention the MR-C 600 Biorad confocal scanning microscope already located in the Biology and Microscopy Center. Dr. Pesacreta, one of the Co-PIs, is the director of this center. While the MR-C 600 is from the late 1980's and early 1990's and probably lacks features available on the instrument requested, some justification of the need for a state-of-the-art instrument, as opposed to the existing one, in current research and in the curriculum, should have been presented. No doubt the MR-C 600 has been updated, but that is only speculation. It is difficult to judge whether the requested instrument will have a significant impact on students or faculty research, when the institution already has a microscope that might be used very effectively to teach the methodology or do the research, but which is not described or mentioned. By not addressing the need to replace or improve upon the microscope currently available, the authors have failed to justify the new facility. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032MUL-08

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Developing a Multidisciplinary Program for Molecular
Simulation, Visualization, and Engineering

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher M. Summa

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

95

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$177,988

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$169,988

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 requesting \$177,988 to establish a 3D visualization core laboratory. This is a well-written and truly multidisciplinary proposal for a facility that has been carefully planned. Chemistry, biology and computer science faculty will all benefit from having this lab. The 3D visualization lab will make a significant contribution to education and research at the University of New Orleans. The expertise of the faculty will ensure project success. The proposed use of the lab workstations and software in courses is well planned. The only weakness in the proposal is the institutional matching funds. Using unrecovered and indirect costs as well as stipends and tuition waivers for graduate students in the principal investigator's (PI's) research program is an unimpressive match. The cost of supplies for the experimental laboratory (\$6,000) at RIC appears to be a lower priority for this proposal and could be reduced or eliminated. Elimination of one workstation (\$9,356) would not affect the project significantly. Partial funding at a level of \$169,988 (a total reduction of \$8,000) is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MUL-08	Enhancement of STEM Learning and Tutoring Center in the Division of Natural Sciences	Dillard University (Physics);	Abdalla Darwish; Allan Burkett; Bernard Singleton; Hadi Alkahby; Reginald Stanton;	1	\$ 88,375
E				Total	\$ 88,375
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines : Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					
002MUL-08	Enhancement of Integrative Teaching and Learning: BEM project	Dillard University (Division of Natural Sciences and Public Health);	Jose Ramirez-Domenech; Amy Lesen; Hong Dai; Wadajo Welldaregay;	1	\$ 41,519
E				Total	\$ 41,519
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines : Mathematics, Special Multidisciplinary					

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003MUL -08	Project Teach Chemistry	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Reginald Stanton; Patricia Ventura;	1	\$ 175,570
				Total	\$ 175,570
N	Proposal is a New Request				
	Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement				
004MUL -08	Collaborative Communications & Webcasting Studio	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (LSU Libraries);	Kelly Blessinger; Faye Phillips; Nancy Colyar;	1	\$ 217,092
				Total	\$ 217,092
E	Proposal is a New Request				
	Disciplines (s): Business, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement				
005MUL -08	Developing Optimal Extraction Paths for an Aquifer Shared by Two States under Alternative Regulatory Scenarios	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	Ricardo Estrada; Krishna Paudel; Mike Dunn;	1 2	\$ 108,342 \$ 49,924
N				Total	\$ 158,266
	Proposal is a New Request				
	Disciplines (s): Mathematics, Special Multidisciplinary				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MUL-08 E	Acquisition of a Super Conducting Quantum Interference Device (SQUID) Magnetometer for Characterization of Magnetic Nanomaterials	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices (CAMD)); Pennington Biomedical Research Center;	Challa S. Kumar; Carola Leuschner; James Spivey; John Scott; Josef Hormes;	1	\$ 248,150
				2	\$
				Total	\$ 248,150

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary

007MUL-08 N	LSU Campus Lake Restoration and Education Project	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Oceanography and Coastal Sciences);	Charles W. Lindau; Pamela B. Blanchard; Ronald D. Delaune;	1	\$ 200,000
				Total	\$ 200,000

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement

008MUL-08 N	Professional Master's Degree Programs for K-12 STEM Teachers	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mathematics);	James Madden; Andrew Maverick; David Kirshner; Frank Neubrandner; Michael Cherry; Nell McAnelly; Scott Baldrige; William Wischusen;	1	\$ 148,840
				2	\$ 49,000
				Total	\$ 197,840

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009MUL -08	Enhancing School Data Accessibility and Utility	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Educational Theory, Policy and Practice);	Paul Mooney; Kevin McCarter;	1	\$ 200,837
N				Total	\$ 200,837
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					
010MUL -08	Metal Containing Diamond Like Carbon Deposition System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices (CAMD));	Varshni Singh; Jost Goettert; Mandi J. Lopez; Ramachandra Devireddy; Todd Monroe; Vadim Palshin;	1	\$ 42,650
E				Total	\$ 42,650
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					
011MUL -08	Facilitating an Enhanced Linear Accelerator at the CAMD Synchrotron Light Source	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices (CAMD));	Victor Suller; John Scott; Kevin Morris;	1	\$ 91,000
E				Total	\$ 91,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012MUL -08	Enhancing Multidisciplinary Animation, Film & Graphics Technology to Promote Economic Development	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Liberal Arts/Sciences);	Jason Makowiak; Jerry Antee; John Vassar; Lamoyne Batten; Patricia Doerr; Paul Sisson; Stephen Banks; Urska Cvek; Wayne Hogue;	1	\$ 71,496
E				Total	\$ 71,496
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Business, Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					
013MUL -08	Learning by Constructing Models in a Virtual World	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Sciences);	John Sigle; Emre Celebi; Gary Boucher;	1	\$ 108,380
E				Total	\$ 108,380
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Mathematics, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					
014MUL -08	H-DIML: High-speed Digital Imaging and Modeling Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Biomedical Engineering);	Mark A. DeCoster; Alan Chiu; Katie Evans;	1	\$ 64,656
E				Total	\$ 64,656
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Mathematics, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015MUL-08	Nanotechnology Lab Enhancement for Pharmaceutical Nanoparticle Manufacture Education	Louisiana Tech University (Biological Engineering);	D. Patrick O'Neal; David K. Mills; Sven Eklund;	1	\$ 45,000
E				Total	\$ 45,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
016MUL-08	Incorporation of Nano-scale Surface Characterization Techniques into LA Tech Chemistry/Physics Integrated Labs	Louisiana Tech University (Chemistry);	Upali Siriwardane; H. Lee Sawyer, Jr.; Haifeng (Frank) Ji; William C. Deese;	1	\$ 85,238
E				Total	\$ 85,238
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Physics/Astronomy, Education Enhancement					
017MUL-08	Enhancing Multidiscipline Product Development and Marketing Through Modern Fabrication Tools	Louisiana Tech University (Mechanical Engineering);	Heath Tims; Douglas Amyx; Jon Pratt; Kelly Crittenden; Michael Swanbom;	1	\$ 58,500
E				Total	\$ 58,500
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Business, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018MUL -08	Enhancing the Honors Experience for Sciences Students at Nicholls State University	Nicholls State University (University Honors Program);	John P. Doucet; Chadwick Young; Cynthia M. Lamberty;	1	\$ 53,390
E				Total	\$ 53,390
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					
019MUL -08	Optimizing Education and Research Transfer with Upgraded Presentation Tools	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Gary J. LaFleur; Brandie Toups; John P. Doucet; Quenton Fontenot;	1	\$ 65,580
E				Total	\$ 65,580
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					
020MUL -08	Advanced Computer Applications in Humanities Scholarship and the Teaching of Writing, Publishing and Professional Writing	Southeastern Louisiana University (English);	David Hanson; Timothy Hudson; Tom Higginbotham;	1 2	\$ 94,834 \$ 49,773
N				Total	\$ 144,607
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Mathematics, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021MUL -08	Pulsed Laser Deposition (PLD) System for Nanoionic and Nanodielectric Thin Film Material Research at SUBR	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Physics);	Rambabu Bobba; D. S. Guo; Fred Lacy; Jin T. Wang; Terrence L. Reese;	1	\$ 190,000
E				Total	\$ 190,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Physics/Astronomy, Special Multidisciplinary					
022MUL -08	The Enhancement of Brunauer, Emmett, and Teller (BET) Surface Area Analyzer Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Conrad Jones; Fred Lacy;	1 2	\$ 36,605 \$
E				Total	\$ 36,605
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
023MUL -08	The Enhancement of High Resolution Imaging Plate for XRD Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Edward E. Doomes; Lawrence Henry;	1 2	\$ 89,600 \$
E				Total	\$ 89,600
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024MUL -08	The Enhancement of Renewable Fuels Laboratory for Sustainable Energy Education at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Edward E. Doomes;	1 2	\$ 182,200 \$
E				Total	\$ 182,200
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
025MUL -08	Improving Access of Minority Students to Biochemical and Geonomics Education	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Natural Sciences);	Solomon Adekunle; Ibrahim Ekaidi; Richard Majeste;	1	\$ 112,083
N				Total	\$ 112,083
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
026MUL -08	Enhancing Research Foundations and Development of Colleges of Business and Education	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Management Information Systems);	David S. Alijani; J. Steven Welsh; James Takona; Obyung Kwun; William Belisle;	1	\$ 63,100
E				Total	\$ 63,100
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Business, Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
027MUL -08	Enhanced Online Speech 210 Course	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Education);	Lora Helvie-Mason; Mary Minter;	1	\$ 10,570
E				Total	\$ 10,570
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					
028MUL -08	Curricula Enhancement with Hands-on Applications in History and Science Education	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Education);	Linda Hill;	1	\$ 53,230
N				Total	\$ 53,230
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary, Education Enhancement					
029MUL -08	Integrated Environmental Engineering, Chemical Engineering and Environmental Science, and Mercury Emissions Control Laboratory	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Civil Engineering);	Daniel Dianchen Gang; Barbara C. Benson; Donald F. Hayes; Rakesh Bajpai; Yen-Shan Liu;	1	\$ 133,120
E				Total	\$ 133,120
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
030MUL -08	Nanotechnology System for Enhancing Chemical and Science Technology Laboratory	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Industrial Technology);	G. H. Massiha; Wu Xu;	1	\$ 81,100
E				Total	\$ 81,100
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
031MUL -08	Confocal Scanning Laser Microscope to Support Teaching and Research of Drug Delivery Systems, Polymer/Tissue Compatibility, and Hydration Inhibited Auto-fluorescence	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemical Engineering);	R. D. K. Misra; A. Gallo; R. S. Srivastava; T. C. Pesacreta;	1	\$ 210,880
E				Total	\$ 210,880
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					
032MUL -08	Developing a Multidisciplinary Program for Molecular Simulation, Visualization, and Engineering	University of New Orleans (Computer Science);	Christopher M. Summa; Mahdi Abdelguerfi; Stephen Winters-Hilt; Steven W. Rick;	1	\$ 177,988
E				Total	\$ 177,988
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Chemistry, Special Multidisciplinary					

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary 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
32	\$ 3,549,925	\$ 3,698,622	\$

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?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- _____ of 6 pts. C.1 To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?

- _____ of 1 pt. C.2 Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?

- _____ of 3 pts. C.3 To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

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

- _____ of 12 pts D.1 Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

COMMENTS:

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

- _____ of 2 pts. E.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

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

- _____ of 10 pts. E.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?
- E.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 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: _____