

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

FY 2005-06

JANUARY-FEBRUARY 2006

Prepared by:

Dr. Charles L. Liotta
Vice Provost for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies
Office of the Provost
Regents' Professor, Chemistry/Chemical Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

FY 2005-06

INTRODUCTION

Twenty-five (25) Multidisciplinary Enhancement proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents for review by several faculty from the Georgia Institute of Technology through the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, a position held by Dr. Charles L. Liotta. The total first-year funds requested in these proposals were \$2,527,133. The total funds allocated to the program were \$942,500. Funds were recommended for nine (9) proposals for total recommended funding of \$917,998.

Dr. Charles L. Liotta received the following materials for review: (a) the twenty-five (25) proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, funding requests, etc.; (c) guidelines for submission of the proposals as a reference tool for reviewers; and (d) two separate rating forms, one for equipment requests and one for other than equipment requests. At a later date, Dr. Liotta had hard and electronic copies of the rating forms.

Because of the diverse nature of these proposals, Dr. Liotta solicited one expert Georgia Tech faculty reviewer for each proposal. See Table I for a listing of the names and units of the reviewers. All of the reviews were returned to Dr. Liotta for compilation and additional evaluation prior to submission to the Louisiana Board of Regents. This report contains three tables that rank all proposals. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table III contains a rank-order list of proposals that are recommended for funding if additional funds become available. Table IV contains a list of proposals that are not recommended for funding. In the compilation of these tables, reviewers used the guidance listed on the rating forms that proposals with a total score below 70 would not be recommended for funding. 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.

The committee assures the Board of Regents and the campuses that each proposal was reviewed and discussed in detail. Each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated. Proposal budgets were carefully reviewed and any items viewed as unjustified, unnecessary, or inflated were reduced as appropriate.

In summary, nine proposals with a score of 89 or above were recommended for funding, and nine more with scores ranging from 72-88 were recommended for funding if additional money becomes available. Seven proposals were not recommended for funding. All proposals that were recommended for full funding are required to maintain the cost-sharing funds as pledged.

Had this Multidisciplinary Enhancement program been allocated an additional \$850,000, the reviewers would have recommended the nine proposals listed in Table III for funding at the level designated for each.

TABLE I
REVIEWER LIST WITH DEPARTMENT AFFILIATION

REVIEWER	UNIT
Peter McGuire	Literature, Comm. & Culture
Brent Cartre	Materials Science & Engineering
Eleanor Alexander	History, Technology & Society
Mary Frank Fox	Public Policy
Douglas Flamming	History, Technology & Society
Nelson Baker	Distance Learning & Prof. Education
Robert Gregor	Applied Physiology
David McDowell	Mechanical Engineering
Andy Smith	Vice Provost, Undergrad. Studies
Ajeet Rohatgi	Electrical & Computer Engineering
Michael Cummins	College of Management
Loren Williams	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Susan Cozzens	Public Policy
Rachel Chen	Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
Thomas DiChristina	Biology
Robert Snyder	Materials Science & Engineering
Willie Pearson	History, Technology & Society
Kirk Bowman	International Affairs
Janet Murray	Literature, Comm. & Culture
Wendy Newstetter	Biomedical Engineering
Gee-Kung Chang	Electrical & Computer Engineering
Amy Bruckman	College of Computing
Dan Fisk	Psychology
Thomas Barnwell	Electrical & Computer Engineering
Bill Hunt	Electrical & Computer Engineering

TABLE II
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	96	005MUL-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$36,555	\$36,555	\$0	\$0
2	95	015MUL-06	SUBR	\$193,718	\$193,718	\$0	\$0
3	93	023MUL-06	ULM	\$62,920	\$48,000	\$0	\$0
4	92	001MUL-06	LSU-BR	\$257,777	\$257,777	\$0	\$0
4	92	016MUL-06	SUBR	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$0	\$0
6	91	018MUL-06	ULL	\$65,000	\$65,000	\$0	\$0
6	91	021MUL-06	ULL	\$64,000	\$64,000	\$0	\$0
8	90	019MUL-06	ULL	\$159,778	\$159,198	\$0	\$0
9	89	010MUL-06	LA TECH	\$13,750	\$13,750	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$933,498	\$917,998	\$0	\$0

TABLE III
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
10	88	017MUL-06	TULANE	\$95,693	\$90,000	\$0	\$0
11	87	006MUL-06	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$49,165	\$49,165	\$0	\$0
12	84	003MUL-06	LSU-BR	\$30,885	\$30,885	\$0	\$0
12	84	012MUL-06	SUBR	\$91,400	\$91,400	\$0	\$0
12	84	020MUL-06	ULL	\$71,120	\$71,120	\$0	\$0
15	82	011MUL-06	NORTHWESTERN	\$92,761	\$92,761	\$0	\$0
15	82	022MUL-06	ULL	\$272,284	\$272,284	\$0	\$0
17	80	014MUL-06	SUBR	\$125,000	\$80,000	\$0	\$0
18	72	024MUL-06	ULM	\$71,567	\$71,567	\$31,835	\$0
TOTALS:				\$899,875	\$849,182	\$31,835	\$0

TABLE IV
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
19	69	002MUL-06	LSU-BR	\$268,700	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	68	025MUL-06	UNO	\$194,772	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	64	007MUL-06	LA TECH	\$66,714	\$0	\$0	\$0
21	64	009MUL-06	LA TECH	\$25,744	\$0	\$10,770	\$0
23	57	013MUL-06	SUBR	\$44,375	\$0	\$0	\$0
24	49	004MUL-06	LSU-BR	\$33,900	\$0	\$18,000	\$0
25	38	008MUL-06	LA TECH	\$59,555	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$693,760	\$0	\$28,770	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Communication Skills via Communication Studios in Three Colleges

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 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

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 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 _____

H. Total Score:

92

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$257,777
Recommended Amount: \$257,777

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

This is a very well-conceived and -planned project that has the potential to be a national model for the improvement of communication skills. Especially noteworthy is the "High Level Communicator" certification that provides students with both a path to and a reward for gaining competence. Also noteworthy is the plan to integrate oral, written, and visual communication skills. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Physical Property Measurement System for Collaborative Materials Science Research and Education

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

H. Total Score:

69

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (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 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: \$268,700
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 from a strong group with acknowledged scientific accomplishments. However, it does not provide thorough descriptions of how the proposed instrument will be used, nor is there a compelling and coherent argument as to its need. See specific criticisms below for sections in which large point deductions were made in scoring the proposal.

Section 4b.2 consists of descriptions of ongoing research projects, not all of which contain plans for utilizing the proposed instrument. Details of how the instrument is to be used and how it will enhance the capabilities of each PI would have been helpful.

Section 4b.3 provides no specific evidence of the potential to achieve a high level of eminence should the proposal be successful, other than that of the reputations and past performances of the proposers. The general claim is made that the instrument will bring added recognition for the departments and researchers involved, but no specifics were presented.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New World Africana Media Library and Speaker Series

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 20 points)
 B.3 20 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (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)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$30,885 (if additional funding
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$30,885 becomes available)

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

This is a highly significant and innovative project that could be used as a model for other African-American and African Studies departments. The reviewers recommend full funding if additional funds become available; however, LSU should follow state guidelines for travel expenditures.

- 1) The project will enhance African-American and African Studies curricula and supplement studies in departments of Sociology, History, English, Religion and Philosophy.
- 2) Speakers in the Speaker Series portion of the project will conduct workshops focusing on the State's cultural resources. The workshops will stimulate research by LSU faculty and students related to State history and culture.
- 3) Faculty and support personnel are highly qualified to implement the program. No additional training is required.
- 4) Items of equipment requested are videos of significant aspects of the African diaspora culture and history. They are essential to the Media Library portion of this project.
- 5) All funds requested are from the Support Fund.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Interdisciplinary Studies at LSU: Women's and Gender Studies

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)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 49 (of 100 points)

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

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u> \$33,900 </u>	Requested Amount: <u> \$18,000 </u>
	Recommended Amount: <u> \$0 </u>	Recommended Amount: <u> \$0 </u>

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

The proposal is clear in its objective: to enhance the capacity and prominence of the program of Women's and Gender Studies. It is unclear, however, how the means proposed (workshops, speaker series, national conference) will help to achieve this goal. At a research university, the prominence of a program should be tied to the research productivity and sponsored funding of faculty. The proposal is not aligned, directly and centrally, to these key means. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Louisiana Agrarian Heritage and Culture Through Visual History

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (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)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$36,555
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$36,555

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 excellent proposal is strongly recommended for full funding because it will significantly enhance the reputation of Louisiana State University-Shreveport and contribute to the cultural development of northwest Louisiana.

The fit between LSU-S' mission and the objectives of this proposal is outstanding. The focus on agrarian life is appropriate for northwest Louisiana and will enhance the usefulness of the visual materials. The collection, preservation, and digitization of the visual history of northwest Louisiana would be an important contribution to the Red River region in terms of pedagogy, cultural development and, quite possibly, heritage tourism.

The digital revolution has boosted the use of visual history in the classroom, in research, and in public history. Photos, maps, and illustrations have always been useful for the Social Sciences and the Humanities, but they were always difficult to access and costly to reproduce. Digital technology can now provide remarkable access at relatively low costs. This proposal, therefore, is in line with current pedagogical and scholarly trends.

Judging from their vita, the PI and Co-PIs of the project are well-suited to the task. They include professors of art, history, literature, and geography--and a valuable mix between younger faculty and those who are well-established scholars (also a valuable gender mix). One Co-PI is affiliated with the Red River Regional Studies Center; another works for the Archives and Special Collections at LSU-S. The multidisciplinary mix and the needed expertise is another valuable component.

Since its inception in the late 1960s, LSU-S' reputation has been increasing and today it is stronger than ever. But it is still rather isolated and is located in an economically depressed part of the State. This project could be a boost to the Red River area, both educationally and economically. The budget request and timetable appear reasonable. The University has pledged to match the Support Fund request (\$36,555) with a contribution of \$35,566--indicating strong institutional support for the project.

Many constituencies will benefit from this project:

- 1) University and K-12 teachers, who will have new and important visual materials in classroom;
- 2) LSU-S students, who will receive training in research and community outreach;
- 3) The citizens of the Red River region, who will learn about--and recognize the importance of--their own histories;
- 4) Museums and historical research centers throughout Louisiana; and
- 5) Scholars across the United States, who will gain access to an important trove of visual materials.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Hybrid Instruction in Computer Science and Mathematics

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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (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 3 (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 9 (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: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$49,165 (if additional funding
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$49,165 becomes available)

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

The reviewers considered this proposed project as having potential. However, several questions needed to be answered.

- 1) What criteria will be used to evaluate the software options? What functional aspects of the curricula and pedagogy are mandatory vs. desired? A rationale for the assessment after describing criteria is needed.
- 2) What criteria will be used to determine necessary disk space and the timeframe for retaining captured information? Are there any requirements for Mac and PC capture and/or delivery?
- 3) More details regarding how training of other faculty will take place are needed. How will other faculty be selected?

If these questions had been answered, the project would have stood a good chance of being funded. However, the committee recommends that this project be fully funded if additional funds became available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Biomechanics Training Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

64

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 10 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 5 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,714
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 request is for relatively minor upgrades to a multi-user biomechanics training laboratory to be used by students from three LA Tech programs. The proposal's strengths are in the lab's multi-user features; its weakness is in that there is no real plan to schedule the facility. Faculty expertise in the details of an EMG analysis system and a 3D motion analysis system is very limited, with little documented evidence of success and no integrated plan for instruction. It appears that each unit's students might benefit from the facility, but will use it independently. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nano-Systems Modeling and Simulation Laboratory

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 4 (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: 38 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$59,555
 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.)

No compelling argument was made for how this investment to increase simulation activities in an existing computer laboratory by upgrading computers and expanding software would benefit research and educational programs. The proposal's premise can be compared to an "acquire it and they will come" argument. Though the PI's expertise is viable, it is unclear if the other two investigators have expertise with regard to Ab Initio and MD computing. Additionally, the faculty do not convey clear ideas or plans for detailed implementation that can be translated into meaningful laboratory instruction, a very challenging proposition. The proposed equipment is not sufficiently ambitious and specialized in scope to support meaningful first principles/MD computing. Thus, no funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Why Do They Leave? Improving Freshman Retention at Louisiana Tech University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

D. 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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 64 (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>\$25,744</u>	Requested Amount: <u>\$10,770</u>
	Recommended Amount: <u>\$0</u>	Recommended Amount: <u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal, with four major goals relating to increasing retention of first-year students, contains no details relating to the psychometric quality of the data collection instruments to be developed or how their quality will be determined. It is possible to implement the planned interventions, but discussion of the implementation of interventions and how they would be implemented should have been clearer. The budget is appropriate, but the proposal is not recommended because of its relatively low score.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Beyond Oil to Renewable Energy

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 20 points)
 B.3 22 (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)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$13,750
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$13,750

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

The proposed series of courses is very creative and innovative. Attacking energy problems both from a cultural and a technological standpoint shows great insight on the part of the PIs. However, it is difficult to understand how the project aligns with the existing University curriculum. Is it a certificate program? Are students expected to take all five courses? If so, how do they fit into their degree programs? If not, does this approach really benefit the students, since they will not see the full picture as envisioned by the program's creators? Despite these questions that reviewers assume will be answered as the project commences, the committee recommends that this proposal be fully funded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Web Site Design and Implementation: Developing a
Multidisciplinary Program to Support Louisiana E-commerce

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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:	<u> \$92,761 </u>	
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$92,761 </u>	(if additional funding becomes available)

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

This is a good proposal with the potential for significant impact on the University and the State. The key to realizing its potential is to ensure that a true partnership develops between the CIS department and the Art department. If they can truly blend art and technology in the classroom and instill that blend in students, the program will be very successful. However, because of a rank of only 82, the committee can only recommend full funding for this proposal if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Peptide Synthesis Capabilities for the Purpose of Scientific Research and Teaching at Southern University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No _____

A.2 4 (of 5 points)

A.3 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)

C.2 0 (of 1 point)

C.3 2 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)

E.2a 10 (For S/E)

or _____ (of 10 points)

E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)

B.2 15 (of 15 points)

B.3 15 (of 20 points)

B.4 4 (of 5 points)

B.5 2 (of 2 points)

B.6 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: 84 (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:	Requested Amount:
	<u>\$91,400</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	Recommended Amount:
	<u>\$91,400</u>	<u>\$0</u>

(if additional funding becomes available)

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

The peptide synthesizer appears to be an important enhancement to the facilities at Southern University and A&M College. The (co-)PIs seem active and energetic. The committee offers two suggestions for improving this proposal:

1) For the biochemistry courses: peptides are not necessary for teaching about buffers. There are more exciting possibilities. What about peptide-based water/ion channels, etc.? There are many potential applications for peptides in the biochemistry curriculum.

2) This strong proposal could have been improved by a more detailed description of how the peptide synthesizer would complement existing instrumentation. For example, a simple protein folding experiment (alpha-helix to random coil) could be performed by NMR. But the existing NMR is not sufficiently described to know if this is possible.

On the whole, this is a worthy proposal that is recommended for full funding if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Accessibility to the Science/Mathematics
Education Ph.D. Program at Southern University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: \$44,375
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 is a modest proposal to provide laptops to students in a unique Science/Mathematics Education Ph.D. program. The benefit to students is clear; what is unclear is the benefit to the institution. The detailed implementation plan and the plans to develop distance curricula are strengths of the proposal. The weakness, however, is that the laptops only benefit the students rather than enhancing the program. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the High Performance Liquid Chromatographic
Capabilities in the Biological Sciences for Research and
Teaching at Southern University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

Total Score: 80 (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>\$125,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$80,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>

(if additional funding becomes available)

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

The reviewers believe that there is clearly a need for the HPLC equipment. However, the particular proposed mix of teaching with research is not a very good idea. In this instance, it may be more effective to purchase two systems with one dedicated to teaching and another to research. The requested model is very high-end; for teaching purposes, a more economical model is sufficient. The purchase price is below \$50,000. The software and computer can be shared among multiple units. Therefore, with the \$80,000 recommended, two decent units could be purchased if additional funds become available. The institutional match should be maintained in full if funding is eventually awarded.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Environmental Science Instruction with Emphasis on Environmental Microbiology

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:

95

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 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: \$193,718
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$193,718

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.)

Dr. Samkutty and her colleagues propose purchase of new equipment for upgrading the environmental microbiology laboratories. The proposal is well written and describes the dire need for equipment to enhance the curricula in environmental microbiology at SUBR. The specific requests include an epifluorescence microscope (\$10,018), spectrophotometer (\$6,100), BOD dissolved oxygen meter (\$1,600), self-stirring BOD probe (\$600), bar code scanner (\$1,100), PCR machine (\$60,000), benchtop sterilizer workstation (\$9,000), bioscreen microbiology reader system (\$31,800), reader software (\$2,000), accelerated solvent extractor system (\$70,000), and extractor software (\$1,500). Full funding is recommended.

Each piece of equipment requested in the proposal is state-of-the-art and would dramatically enhance the quality of education in the laboratories. The PI and co-PIs are faculty members in the Departments of Biological Sciences and Civil and Environmental Engineering, a combination reflecting the need for upgrading to a more technologically advanced systems level in the proposed new laboratories. Research in environmental microbiology is now highly dependent on a systems approach to tackle complex environmental problems that single scientific or engineering disciplines are unable to answer (e.g., microbial biodegradation of pollutants, as outlined in this proposal). The systems approach requires a broad range of technologies: tools of analytical chemistry, advanced molecular biology, and microscopy. Purchase of such state-of-the-art technology will ensure that students are exposed to the advanced "tool box" that industry and academia now utilize in environmental microbiology research. The students will therefore be trained either to join the workforce immediately or to pursue advanced studies in graduate school. The only suggestion would be for the PIs to consider upgrading the spectrophotometer to a more advanced model (e.g., Shimadzu UV1601 at \$20,000) that is capable of automated kinetic measurements (enzyme activities, pollutant concentrations) at extremely fast time scales.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016MUL-06

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of X-ray Powder Diffractometer Capabilities
in the Material Sciences for Research and Teaching

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)

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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$80,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$80,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This well-written proposal requests funds for a critical piece of research and teaching equipment. The high-resolution XRD proposed is robust and will serve Southern University well. Full funding is recommended for this deserving proposal that also has some matching funds.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017MUL-06

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Networking Minority Education in the Sciences and Humanities
(N-MESH)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 19 (of 20 points)
 B.3 22 (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)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$95,693 </u>	
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$90,000 </u>	(if additional funding becomes available)

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

The PI's response to item B.3 is somewhat overstated. The jump in national prestige vis-à-vis Harvard and other educational institutions of that caliber is unlikely to develop or result from a modest (less than \$100,000) investment. The cover page indicates that the proposal's foci are the Humanities and Multidisciplinary, but the medical/health disciplinary component is underdeveloped.

The request for expenses for the South African artist should be eliminated from the proposal budget. Instead, the PI should be able to locate someone from the Western hemisphere who can deliver a cross-cultural perspective in keeping with the primary goals of the Diaspora. Funding of \$90,000 is recommended if additional funds become available. The full institutional match should be maintained.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Traditional Access for Tomorrow's Americas

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 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 11 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes 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:

91

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$65,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$65,000

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.)

Latin American Studies and Latin America are increasingly important to educational and economic vitality in the American South. This project provides many multimedia tools for enhancing the study of the region and its people. The institutional match pledged is significant. The proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High-Definition Television (HDTV) Enhancement for Field
Recording and Editing Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

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 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

H. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$159,778
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$159,198

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.)

HDTV is the new standard for the television broadcast industry. This enhancement will give UL Lafayette an advantage in recruitment, internships, and job placement, as well as providing support for local industry. The equipment list on pp. 14-15 includes hand corrections and inconsistencies with the budget justification on pp. 20-21. The reviewers assume these are clerical errors that will need to be corrected when the contract is prepared. Because it is anticipated that there will be some cost savings involved in equipment procurement, the reviewers recommend a slight reduction (\$580). Funding of \$159,198 is recommended for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computational Resources for Cognitive Science

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 1 (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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 18 (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 _____

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: \$71,120 (if additional funding becomes available)
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: \$71,120

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

This is a well-conceived and carefully justified proposal to provide the technological framework to expand the Cognitive Science program and capabilities at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. The equipment and software requested are appropriate for the anticipated impacts articulated in the proposal. The project is not overly ambitious or unachievable. The PIs are very much on-target in regard to the possibilities that the infusion of new computing equipment could have on the Cognitive Science program but, more importantly, on the University. Appropriate impacts could occur in both the teaching and research capabilities. Further, these impacts will benefit both undergraduate and graduate students in the ability to deliver higher caliber courses using computational modeling and statistics. Because funds for Multidisciplinary proposals are limited and other proposals ranked higher than 84, reviewers were able to recommend funding for this proposal only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Laboratory for Information Processing and Data
Communications in Fiber System

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$64,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$64,000

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 proposed laboratory for information processing and data communications in fiber systems could play an important role in both academic and research areas of optical fiber technology and information science at UL-Lafayette. The proposers justified the practical benefits of the project very well by clearly describing how the lab can help students obtain hands-on experience in cutting-edge telecom and information technologies. The potential impacts on industry, the University, and students are also well explained. Overall, the merit of the proposal is recognized, and full funding for the project is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Educational Video Gaming Research
Infrastructure

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**D. 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 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 20 points)
 B.3 22 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$272,284</u>	
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$272,284</u>	(if additional funding becomes available)

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

This project explores an important and current area of research, and the project team is highly qualified. Overall, funding of this proposal is recommended, but because of its comparatively low ranking, it can be funded only if additional funds become available.

The proposal as written is over-ambitious. It would have been easier to evaluate if the specific software platform to be used was identified. Using the wrong base platform would cause problems; the choice of platform is, thus, very important.

Another element missing from the proposal is the content to be learned. It is impossible to create a general-purpose platform. Choosing a particular set of learning objectives would help focus development work, and also help with the choice of software platform. The committee suggests remaining as close as possible to the investigator's past successful work on Alien Rescue. Just getting the base platform working and demonstrating that learning occurs is more than enough work to fill multiple years. The PIs should be reluctant to try to address questions like gender and realism too early on--get the basics right first.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Gerontology Faculty Enhancement and Program Accreditation

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$62,920 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$48,000 </u>

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

The application describes commendable development to date of the Master of Arts in gerontology program and provides a compelling discussion of needed enhancements which would be possible with the requested funds. Discussion of the "aging" of Louisiana and the opportunities make clear the value under this category.

Although the proposal has much merit and is apt to provide needed additional resources to the primary gerontology program at ULM, the budget seems excessive and the justification minimal. For example, the ASA website lists \$660 as the on-site registration fee for non-members. Early registration is \$510. It is also not clear how the \$2,500 per-trip travel cost was calculated. It is recommended that a per-trip cost of \$1,300 be budgeted, to include hotel, meals, taxi, and airport parking costs based on the ASA current registration for the upcoming event in Anaheim, CA. Airfare is \$485 on Delta with a deeply discounted ticket. Therefore, a total cost of \$1,800 (travel) and \$510 (registration) is recommended. State guidelines for travel must be closely followed. A reduced award of \$48,000 is recommended for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: First Year Success: Customized Online Video Orientation Tutorials

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. 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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	<u>\$71,567</u>	<u>\$31,835</u>
	Requested Amount:	
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>
	(if additional funding becomes available)	

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

The proposal addresses an important and relevant problem. Overall, it is well conceived and achievable. It also provides a basis for further such developments, if it were to be successful. The proposed testing procedures are consistent with current practice in the area and would clearly be publishable. They are, however, micro-focused in a basically macro project. Because of its relatively low ranking, the committee recommends funding of the first-year request (\$71,567) only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025MUL-06

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Nanopore Detector Lab for Transcription Factor
Biochemistry/Drug Discovery Research and Education

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (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 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:

68

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$194,772
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 application reads more like a proposal for laboratory research equipment than for any discernible educational purposes. This finding would certainly advance the PI's research capabilities in an interesting and unique area (only Harvard and UCSD have similar capabilities), but the educational impact of such a limited, highly specialized protocol is questionable. No funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary
for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MUL -06	Enhancing Communication Skills via Communication Studios in Three Colleges	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Communication, Engineering, English, Art & Design);	Lillian Bridwell -Bowles; James Catano; Marchita Mauck; Patricia Suchy; Warren Waggenpack;	1	\$ 257,777
N				Total	\$ 257,777
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines : Engineering B, Humanities					
002MUL -06	A Physical Property Measurement System for Collaborative Materials Science Research and Education	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Physics & Astronomy, Chemistry, Chemical Eng., Electrical & Computer Eng.);	John F. DiTusa; Bingqing Wei; David P. Young; Elizabeth Podlaha; Julia Y. Chan; Paul S. Russo; Theda Daniels -Race;	1	\$ 268,700
E				Total	\$ 268,700
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines : Engineering B					

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003MUL -06	New World Africana Media Library and Speaker Series	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (African and African American Studies);	Angelletta K. M. Gourdine; Alma Dawson; Nghana Lewis;	1	\$ 30,885
E				Total	\$ 30,885
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Humanities					
004MUL -06	Enhancing Interdisciplinary Studies at LSU: Women's and Gender Studies	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Women's & Gender Studies, Curriculum & Instruction, Biological Sciences);	Becky Ropers-Huilman; John Larkin; Nina Asher;	1 2	\$ 33,900 \$ 18,000
N				Total	\$ 51,900
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Humanities					
005MUL -06	Enhancing Louisiana Agrarian Heritage and Culture Through Visual History	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Liberal Arts, Fine Arts, Foreign Languages & Humanities; History/SocSci);	R. Michael Graham; David L. Anderson; Gary D. Joiner; Helen C. Taylor; John S. Vassar; LaMoyne Batten; Laura L. McLemore;	1	\$ 36,555
N				Total	\$ 36,555
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Social Sciences, Humanities					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MUL -06	Hybrid Instruction in Computer Science and Mathematics	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Computer Science, Mathematics);	John Sigle; Deborah K. Shepherd; Wanda K. Moseley;	1	\$ 49,165
E				Total	\$ 49,165
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences					
007MUL -06	Biomechanics Training Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Biomedical Engineering, Health & Exercise Sci., & Industrial Engineering);	Stan Cronk; Jun-Ing Ker; Wendy Miletello;	1	\$ 66,714
E				Total	\$ 66,714
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering B					
008MUL -06	Nano-Systems Modeling and Simulation Laboratory	Louisiana Tech University (Institute for Micromanufacturing, Physics);	Pedro Derosa; Abdul Khaliq; Kody Varahramyan;	1	\$ 59,555
E				Total	\$ 59,555
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering B					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009MUL -06	Why Do They Leave? Improving Freshmen Retention at Louisiana Tech University	Louisiana Tech University (Human Ecology);	Tammy S. Harpel; Anita Pumphrey; Norman Pumphrey;	1	\$ 25,744
				2	\$ 10,770
				Total	\$ 36,514
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Social Sciences					
010MUL -06	Beyond Oil to Renewable Energy	Louisiana Tech University (Liberal Arts, Soc. Sci., Biology, Architecture, History, Mech. Engineering);	Richard N. Hutchinson; A. Joshua Leffler; David M. Anderson; Kelly Crittenden; Vibhavari Jani;	1	\$ 13,750
				Total	\$ 13,750
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Social Sciences					
011MUL -06	Web Site Design and Implementation: Developing a Multidisciplinary Program to Support Louisiana E-commerce	Northwestern State University (Computer Information Systems, Art);	Lissa Pollacia; Michael Yankowski; Robert Moreau; William Lomerson;	1	\$ 92,761
				Total	\$ 92,761
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012MUL -06	The Enhancement of Peptide Synthesis Capabilities for the Purpose of Scientific Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry, Biology, Environmental Toxicology);	Michelle O. Fletcher Claville; Chao-Yun T. Shih; DeWayne Logan; Wesley Gray;	1 2 .	\$ 91,400 \$
E				Total	\$ 91,400

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Biological Sciences

013MUL -06	Enhancing Student Accessibility to the Science/Mathematics Education Ph.D. Progm at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Science/Mathematics Education);	Lynn B. Loftin;	1 .	\$ 44,375
E				Total	\$ 44,375

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences

014MUL -06	Enhancing the High Performance Liquid Chromatographic Capabilities in the Biological Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry, Biology, Environmental Toxicology);	Dewayne Logan; Chao-Yun Shih; Michelle Claville; Wesley Gray;	1 2 .	\$ 125,000 \$
E				Total	\$ 125,000

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Biological Sciences

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015MUL -06	Enhancement of Environmental Science Instruction with Emphasis on Environmental Microbiology	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Biological Sciences, Civil & Environmental Engineering);	Pushpa Samkutty; Deidra Atkins-Ball; Sharlenitia Clark; Yvette Weatherton;	1	\$ 193,718
E				Total	\$ 193,718
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Biological Sciences					
016MUL -06	The Enhancement of X-ray Powder Diffractometer Capabilities in the Material Sciences for Research and Teaching	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Chemistry, Physics);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Edward E. Doomes; Lawrence Henry;	1 2	\$ 80,000 \$
E				Total	\$ 80,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Special Multidisciplinary					
017MUL -06	Networking Minority Education in the Sciences and Humanities (N-MESH)	Tulane University (English and African Diaspora Studies);	Felipe Smith; Nghana Lewis;	1	\$ 95,693
N				Total	\$ 95,693
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Humanities					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018MUL -06	Traditional Access for Tomorrow's Americas	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Modern Languages, History, English, Library);	Leslie Bary; A. David Barry; Beate Kukainis; Christopher Grimes; Julia Frederick;	1	\$ 65,000
N				Total	\$ 65,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Humanities					
019MUL -06	High-Definition Television (HDTV) Enhancement for Field Recording and Editing Laboratory	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Communication, English);	William R. Davie; Charles E. Richard; John Korbel; Lucian F. Dinu; Michael Gervais; Philip J. Auter;	1	\$ 159,778
E				Total	\$ 159,778
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Social Sciences					
020MUL -06	Computational Resources for Cognitive Science	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Institute of Cognitive Science, English);	Michael Kalish; Claiborne Rice; Mark Honegger; Michele Feist;	1	\$ 71,120
E				Total	\$ 71,120
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Social Sciences					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021MUL -06	The Laboratory for Information Processing and Data Communications in Fiber System	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical and Computer Engineering, Center for Advanced Computer Studies);	Zhongqi Pan; George Thomas; Gui-Liang Feng; Robert R. Henry;	1	\$ 64,000
E				Total	\$ 64,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences					
022MUL -06	Development of Educational Video Gaming Research Infrastructure	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Ctr for Innovative Learn. & Assess. Tech., Ctr for Advanced Comp. Studies);	Douglas C. Williams; Jim Etheredge; Timothy Roden; Yuxin Ma;	1	\$ 272,284
N				Total	\$ 272,284
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences					
023MUL -06	Gerontology Faculty Enhancement and Program Accreditation	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Gerontology);	James Bulot;	1	\$ 62,920
N				Total	\$ 62,920
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Biological Sciences					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
024MUL-06	First Year Success: Customized Online Video Orientation Tutorials	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Student Success Center, Educational Leadership);	Barbara Michaelides; Holly Casey; Michael Beutner;	1 2	\$ 71,567 \$ 31,835
N				Total	\$ 103,402

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Computer/Information Sciences, Humanities

025MUL-06	A Nanopore Detector Lab for Transcription Factor Biochemistry/Drug Discovery Research and Education	University of New Orleans (Computer Science);	Stephen Winters-Hilt; Vassil Roussev;	1	\$ 194,772
E				Total	\$ 194,772

Proposal is a **New Request**

Disciplines (s): Biological Sciences, Computer/Information Sciences

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary for the FY 2005-2006 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
25	\$ 2,527,133	\$ 2,587,738	\$942,500

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES _____ NO _____
- _____ of 5 pts. 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 20 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.2 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.3 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.4 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.5 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?

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 2005-06**

**RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES _____ NO _____
- _____ of 5 pts. 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 25 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 25 pts. B.2 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.3 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.4 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.5 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?

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 12 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 2 pts.

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

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

_____ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES___ NO_____

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount: \$ _____

Recommended Amount: \$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____

Date: _____
(Form 6.12, rev.2004)