

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

### **INTRODUCTION**

The review panel consisted of Dr. Suzanne Beal (chair), Vice President of Academic Affairs, Frederick (Maryland) Community College; Dr. Bonnie Brunkhorst, Professor of Geological Sciences and Science Education, California State University San Bernadino; Dr. Floyd Coleman, Professor, Department of Art, Howard University; and Dr. James Story, Professor of Anatomy (emeritus), Meharry (Tennessee) Medical College. A total of 48 proposals were submitted in FY 2006-07 for consideration in the Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram.

In December 2006, each panel member received a copy of all proposals, rating forms, and associated information regarding the proposal evaluation criteria and procedure and the RFP guidelines. After individually studying the proposals, the panel met in Baton Rouge, February 2-3, 2007, to evaluate all proposals. In the panel meetings each proposal was individually discussed and its merits evaluated with respect to the established criteria. All proposals received thorough and impartial review. After the panel discussed the individual members' evaluations, they arrived at rankings and funding recommendations for all proposals. It should be noted that the Traditional Enhancement Engineering A panel also reviewed proposal nos. 006UG-07 and 018UG-07 since they were the only two proposals submitted in an Engineering A discipline during this funding cycle. Since no member of the Undergraduate Enhancement panel is a professional engineer either by academic background or current teaching assignment, the BoR Sponsored Programs staff decided to have both panels review those proposals. As a result, both panels came to the same conclusion: recommending funding for one but not the other. Though point values differed somewhat between the two panels, the points shown on the rating forms in this report are the result of the Engineering A panel's deliberations.

With the \$1,620,000 available in the program during this cycle, the panel recommended that one-third of the proposals receive full funding; another third receive partial funding, and the final third not be funded. Each proposal's individual goals, related objectives, and budgets were thoroughly scrutinized in making partial funding recommendations. For proposals recommended for funding, a full or partial award amount is also specified. Since \$1,620,000 could support only about one-half of the total funding requested, partial funding was recommended if it was consistent with the viability of the individual proposal's goals and budget.

Table I and Table II are contained herein, categorizing all proposals submitted in two groups: (1) those highly recommended for funding, and 2) those not recommended for funding. Following the ranked list of proposals is a detailed review of each proposal. Appendix A contains a list of all proposals submitted, and Appendix B contains a copy of the composite rating forms used by the panel to rate and rank the proposals.

### **Recommendations of the Panel and Suggestions to Applicants**

The panel strongly recommends that applicants more closely match proposals to eligible funding disciplines and faculty expertise. For example, this year in particular, some proposals submitted in the Earth and Environmental Sciences discipline were more closely related to Biology; additionally, these proposals demonstrated a lack of active participation of geosciences faculty who should be involved in any environmental sciences projects.

Applicants should always match the rationale for the project with the proposed activities and the proposed budget. In some proposals the panel noticed an obvious disconnect between what the applicant was attempting to accomplish and how he or she explained the activities in the project plan. Any proposal whose budget did not correlate closely with project goals and activities could not be recommended even for partial funding.

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

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	99	022UG-07	LSUS	\$42,684	\$40,684
2	98	026UG-07	LOY	\$58,026	\$58,026
2	98	045UG-07	SLU	\$49,241	\$49,241
4	97	031UG-07	NIC	\$15,804	\$15,804
5	96	020UG-07	LSUS	\$29,781	\$29,781
5	96	025UG-07	LOY	\$67,588	\$67,588
5	96	047UG-07	SUNO	\$24,951	\$24,951
8	94	001UG-07	BPCC	\$42,409	\$42,409
8	94	021UG-07	LSUS	\$26,899	\$26,899
10	93	034UG-07	NIC	\$26,889	\$26,889
11	92	032UG-07	NIC	\$23,545	\$23,545
11	92	041UG-07	SLU	\$70,000	\$70,000
11	92	042UG-07	SLU	\$50,112	\$50,112
14	90	019UG-07	LSUS	\$27,000	\$27,000
14	90	038UG-07	NIC	\$21,907	\$21,907
16	89	009UG-07	DIL	\$80,320	\$59,120
16	89	016UG-07	LSUA	\$101,256	\$75,942
16	89	043UG-07	SLU	\$140,807	\$105,605
19	88	023UG-07	LOY	\$54,540	\$40,905
20	87	015UG-07	LA COLLEGE	\$92,282	\$69,212
20	87	017UG-07	LSUS	\$43,770	\$32,827
22	85	002UG-07	CEN	\$35,957	\$26,968
22	85	011UG-07	DIL	\$97,429	\$73,072
22	85	012UG-07	DIL	\$82,679	\$69,679
22	85	046UG-07	SLU	\$97,459	\$73,094
26	82	029UG-07	NIC	\$33,045	\$24,783
27	81	040UG-07	NSU	\$125,008	\$112,508
28	79	004UG-07	DIL	\$72,487	\$30,300
28	79	008UG-07	DIL	\$189,396	\$63,000
30	78	018UG-07	LSUS	\$16,860	\$16,860
31	77	027UG-07	McNEESE	\$53,655	\$24,289
32	75	014UG-07	GSU	\$221,104	\$110,000
33	74	044UG-07	SLU	\$75,000	\$37,000
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$2,189,890</b>	<b>\$1,620,000</b>

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

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
34	69	030UG-07	NIC	\$69,042	\$0
34	69	036UG-07	NIC	\$30,000	\$0
36	68	035UG-07	NIC	\$54,235	\$0
37	67	033UG-07	NIC	\$33,632	\$0
38	66	003UG-07	DIL	\$58,549	\$0
38	66	013UG-07	DIL	\$98,094	\$0
40	65	028UG-07	NIC	\$60,128	\$0
40	65	037UG-07	NIC	\$33,776	\$0
42	64	039UG-07	NSU	\$13,915	\$0
43	62	007UG-07	DIL	\$119,588	\$0
44	61	048UG-07	ULM	\$55,800	\$0
45	59	006UG-07	DIL	\$93,235	\$0
46	51	010UG-07	DIL	\$78,176	\$0
47	47	024UG-07	LOY	\$23,500	\$0
47	47	005UG-07	DIL	\$72,306	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$893,976</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-07

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Terri Mundi

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Training for Pharmacy Technicians

## 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)

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

94
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$42,409  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$42,409

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.)

Workforce readiness for the pharmacy technician program (PTEC) is the primary goal of this application. By complementing the current curriculum with state-of-the-art "barcode technology", students' learning experiences will be enhanced and their marketability strengthened. The proposal is well written, with ample statistics and documentation of needs. For example, it is projected that by 2020, up to 400,000 pharmacists will be needed to handle increased prescription volume. It is projected that this number will not be reached; the pharmacist assistant will fill the void.

The project's positive impact on the quality of instruction (faculty) and learning (students) is commensurate with the quality of equipment, and the supplies requested are warranted. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-07

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas Rust

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Music for the Movies

## 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 0 (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)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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

H. Total Score: 

85
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$35,957  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$26,968

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

This proposal requests equipment that is standard for state-of-the-art music programs. The request is for audio equipment to produce high-quality recordings for student projects and audition pieces. What makes the proposal unique is the proposed collaboration between the music and film departments. Recently the American Association of Colleges and Universities issued a blue panel report, *Greater Expectations*, that enumerated the most effective educational practices that result in intentional learning; i.e., the pursuit of a student's personal cognitive goals over and above class requirements, and accomplishing more than the minimum tasks required by the curricula. Collaboration across disciplines and hands-on learning are among the most important. This project fosters both. Although this is a strong proposal, the demonstrated need for movie film scoring is limited. The panel recommends partial funding of \$26,968. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Barnes

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Printmaking and Learning Laboratory (P.A.L.L.)

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1           4           (of 5 points)  
B.2          13           (of 15 points)  
B.3          16           (of 20 points)  
B.4           4           (of 5 points)  
B.5           2           (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          10           (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1           0           (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes           X           No                   

H. Total Score: 

66
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:           \$58,549            
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:           \$0          

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

The proposal was neither carefully organized nor developed. While Dillard University has a history of mounting good programs in the arts, the proposal does not provide a strong case for the proposed project. The panel does not recommend support for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin J. Bastian

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project: Supplement Instructions in Health and Medical Sciences

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)  
 D.2a 5 (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 12 (of 20 points)  
 B.3 17 (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 4 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**G. Total Score:** 79 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$72,487  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$30,300

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 very broad program is intended to enhance graduate and professional school preparation for students in natural sciences, public health, and nursing by supplementing instruction in each school with mentoring, admissions test preparations, academic support services, counseling, and career planning. It is envisioned that various support programs offered in the summer and during the regular school year will improve students' test-taking skills and promote self-confidence, which will increase the number of underrepresented minorities entering and graduating from graduate or professional schools. In addition, institutional funds and student services funds will help support enrichment programs. Funding of \$30,300 is recommended; reductions should include \$12,187 for the project director's release time, \$15,000 for faculty mentors, and \$7,500 for the program assistant. The final recommendation is to eliminate either some funds for peer mentors or some of the laptop computers. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby L. Broadway

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Computerized Earth Science Instruction at Dillard 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 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 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 0 (of 5 points)  
B.2 5 (of 15 points)  
B.3 5 (of 20 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 2 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

47
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$72,306  
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 is designed for enhancing computer labs for the instruction of approximately 470 biology and biology education majors, to be utilized also by "faculty members of the Biology and Chemistry departments." The project director has graduate academic training in molecular biology and developmental biochemistry. This proposal does not appear to be an earth/environmental sciences proposal, even though it is incorrectly indicated as such on the cover page. The panel recommends resubmission as a biology proposal in an appropriate year and does not recommend funding at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby L. Broadway

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction in Pre-engineering

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2 4 (of 5 points)  
A.3 3.3 (of 5 points)

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 2.3 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 0.3 (of 2 points)  
D.2a 8 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
D.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4.7 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12.3 (of 20 points)  
B.3 13 (of 25 points)  
B.4 3.3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2.3 (of 2 points)  
B.6 4.2 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1.3 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

59
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$93,235

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 is unclear as to the nature of Dillard University's pre-engineering program. The institution has no engineering degree program and the applicants have not teamed with a school of engineering that could potentially benefit from the joint program. The relationship between the project budget, its objectives and plan, needs to be better stated. For example, the PIs do not name the individuals to be responsible for each task, nor how each task will be accomplished. In fact, little of the proposed effort seems to be directed towards engineering. The panel believes the proposal would have been stronger had it not mentioned engineering, since the proposal's connections to the current degree programs are stronger. Discussion of the numbers of students to be impacted and how those numbers affect the proposal's budget were inconsistent throughout the proposal. The panel recommends that the PIs seek NSF and/or DoEd funding for this program, not BoRSF monies. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonya Caston

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Undergraduate Agricultural Sciences Initiative  
Through Instruction and Research

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

H. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$119,588

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.)

Apparently this proposal's goals are to integrate agricultural science topics in current STEM courses, develop an agricultural science course, and provide seminars for agricultural science careers. However, the plan of the project is not presented well. There is no project summary. It is stated that the applicants are requesting BoR support (\$119,587.95) for the PIs to "determine the software and equipment that is suitable to carry out the goals of the project" (p. 2). The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal because of these kinds of uncertainties and lack of clarity in the feasibility of its objectives.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cortheal M. Clark

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The "Hollywood-South Project": Developing a Multimedia  
Interdisciplinary-Curriculum Center (ICC) Subsequent to the  
Impact of the Film Industry's Invasion of Louisiana

**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: 79 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 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 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$189,396  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$63,000

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

This proposal makes an effective case for the importance of the nascent film industry to New Orleans and the need to train prospective industry personnel. However, the proposal is not altogether convincing. There is no discussion of the current curriculum and how the requested equipment will fit into it. There is no discussion of the number of students enrolled in the program or recruitment strategies to increase that number. Additionally, the plan for the ICC is only sketchily presented, and the budget is not accurate. Lastly, there is no project evaluation plan. Despite these limitations, the economic potential of this initiative is very strong. The panel recommends start-up funding of \$63,000. The PI may want to submit a more well-developed proposal in another cycle after demonstrating more convincingly that the program is viable. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Betty P. Dennis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Pre-Nursing Education

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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: \$80,320

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,120

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.)

Dillard's nursing curriculum was recently revised and strengthened. The proposed project will improve the pre-nursing students' acquisition of concepts and skills required for success as a nurse: a four-week summer program for accepted students (featuring workshops/classes in mathematics, chemistry, study skills, critical thinking, and healthcare ethics) will be followed by a pre-nursing curriculum, including didactic and clinical experiences. The enhancement plan is centered around "how" to study as well as the acquisition of knowledge necessary to become a quality nurse (graduate). Since many nurses and other healthcare professionals did not return to the New Orleans vicinity following Katrina and Rita, jobs for graduates should be available. "Significant" in-kind dollars will also support this proposal. Recommended reductions include \$8,000 for two semesters of the coordinator's salary and \$10,000 in stipends; other cuts may be made at the PIs' discretion. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jose Ramirez Domenech

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Environmental Sciences Education Enhancement Program  
(ESEEP)

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 6 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 20 points)  
B.3 12 (of 25 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

51
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,176  
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 seeks support for teaching and research activities by obtaining resources lost during Hurricane Katrina and for summer research collaboration in Costa Rica (six students, three faculty, and consultants). In this curriculum, environmental education issues are included in biology courses. Environmental health and ecology applications of biology to environmental issues are necessary, but not sufficient, for true environmental science. This project sorely needs more direction by a faculty member with academic expertise in the earth sciences. The interdisciplinary applications are laudable, but they need to be complete to examine all of the variables in environmental studies. What environmental data are to be compared? The applicant needs to define the research questions and to seek a complete complement of expertise to guide research in the environmental sciences. For these reasons the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal this year.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte S. Hurst

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction Through Technology in Nursing  
with PDAs: The Point-of-Care (POC) Project

**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: 85 (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 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$97,429

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$73,072

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 Point-of-Care project's primary goal is to train students in the use of PDAs in various clinical settings, which decreases medication errors, adjusts to patient care needs, and familiarizes students with technology uses in healthcare situations. Sophomores to seniors will be the main beneficiaries of this project. The faculty will identify curriculum changes to accommodate PDA applications. The panel leaves it to the discretion of the PI as to which items to remove from the budget to meet the recommended award level of \$73,072. The institutional match may be reduced slightly, but the match for personnel training must be maintained at \$5,000.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Carlen L. McLin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Public Health Curriculum and Instruction  
Through the Public Health Dry 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 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 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 5 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

85
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$82,679

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$69,679

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 state-of-the-art equipment upgrade described in this proposal will enhance students' quality of study and increase their chances of entering and succeeding in graduate public health programs and/or the public health job market. Computer skills acquisition is crucial to their success, especially via updated resources in the Public Health Dry Laboratory. Such an enhancement will impact three public health courses: epidemiology, needs assessment, and research methodology. Equally important, entry into Tulane University's School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine via an established "early entry" arrangement would be strengthened. The panel notes that Dillard University is the only undergraduate school in Louisiana that offers a baccalaureate degree in Public Health. The panel recommends an award of \$69,679, eliminating PI and Co-PI travel (\$3,500), and reducing costs associated with workshops (\$9,500) by holding them on campus. Nevertheless, the institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zujia Xu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Computational Environmental Science  
Instruction and Research

## 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 6 (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 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 2 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

66
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$98,094  
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 proposes establishing a computer bank for computational chemical engineering research to include a new course called "Introduction to Computational Environmental Sciences," using simulations based on oxygen and carbon dioxide net ecosystem exchanges. It is claimed that over 400 students would benefit. The faculty identified do not have academic backgrounds in environmental sciences, but they do have computer science expertise. External earth sciences expertise is referenced without specificity or role in the proposed project, and the budget does not support the external earth sciences consultant cited. This proposal appears to be a computer sciences faculty enhancement project with the primary focus on chemical engineering. The goals are lofty and the proposed activities indefinite. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal in light of other more appropriate and justified proposals.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014UG-07

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rosemary Mokia

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Resources in Health Sciences

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  11   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  16   (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   8   (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   1   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$221,104    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$110,000  

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

This is a well-written proposal to increase intellectual resources for the health sciences program by creating a computer media area in the library, updating periodicals, and easily accessing them by creating instructional resources and enhancing library staff leadership. The faculty cited does not, however, include expertise in the health sciences. The panel expressed grave concerns about librarians' judgments related to health sciences resources to be selected. They need guidance from consultant(s) in health sciences. The panel recommends that the PIs undergo at least two days of health sciences consultation to identify the appropriate resources and advise them concerning the instructional uses of these resources to be selected with the recommended award of \$110,000. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mike Brunet

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Athletic Training Educational Curriculum Enhancement and Future Graduate Education Through the Addition of Therapeutic Modality and Rehabilitation Equipment and the Addition of a New Cadaver Laboratory

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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: \$92,282

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$69,212

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 requests therapeutic modality and rehabilitation equipment and addition of a human cadaver laboratory to benefit athletic training education, biology, nursing, and other health sciences career programs. The proposal is well-written and -justified. Funding of \$69,212 is recommended, with the elimination of all smart board expenses. Other cuts may be made at the PIs' discretion. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sheryl Herring

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment to Enhance the Clinical Laboratory Science Program

## 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)

## 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 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 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

89
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$101,256  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$75,942

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.)

LSU-A seeks funding to modernize the clinical laboratory science program that is currently utilized for training technicians in an area of social need. Instrumentation and related molecular diagnostic principles applied to their CLT program will lead to career training and exposure of potential students to career options. The Biology and Allied Health Departments will benefit from the project. This is a single year equipment proposal with outcomes to be measured annually beyond the project's duration. The equipment need is well justified. Expertise of and active faculty involvement in project-related fields support the project's outcomes. Funding of \$75,942 is recommended for this project; the PIs have full discretion to decide which line items to reduce. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Alford

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Black Box Theatre

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

87
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$43,770  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$32,827

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

This proposal has several important strengths: 1. Black Box theater spaces are increasingly important educational performance spaces; 2. The collaboration with the Bossier Parish community is a significant effort to maximize resources as well as provide a seamless transition for students; and 3. The Black Box is an ideal venue to offer provocative plays with nontraditional casts and plays whose audience appeal may be limited. However, the budget seems excessive for the project, particularly in the subcategory of miscellaneous items (\$5,500). The panel recommends partial funding of \$32,827, with full discretion given to the PI as to where to reduce the budget. The institutional match may also be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Boucher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Upgrade to Enhance Undergraduate Courses in Microprocessor and Instrumentation Electronics

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2 4.3 (of 5 points)  
A.3 3.7 (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 1.7 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 7.7 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 14 (of 20 points)  
B.4 3.7 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1.6 (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 10.3 (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: 

78
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$16,860

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$16,860

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 applicant describes in detail the institution's eminence, but the panel is a bit unclear as to the value added which will accrue from this project. While an adequate plan for the equipment is presented, it is again a little unclear how the lathe would have a significant impact on some of the courses, or why a better lathe (i.e., gap bed) is deemed necessary. Some examples of its intended uses would have added clarity. Although the project's goals and objectives could have benefited from a tighter focus, the panel nevertheless was impressed with the overall effort, and full funding of \$16,860 is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dalton R. Gossett

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Experiential Learning in Environmental  
Science at LSUS

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. 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 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 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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 

90
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$27,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$27,000

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 PI proposes the enhancement of student experiences in environmental research and of faculty in the biological sciences, in cooperation with LSUS's Red River Watershed Management Institute and government agencies. Areas of concern for Louisiana in watershed and ground surface water quality are cited. Students will join faculty in studying interrelationships between agriculture and watershed management. However, the biology faculty are the only participants to be supported. The panel suggests that expertise in geological sciences is needed to identify geological variables and processes affecting the quality and management of the watershed in addition to its life processes. The panel recommends fully funding the proposal; however, the PI and Co-PI should engage a geoscientist as an equal partner with the biology faculty.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Michael Graham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Broadening Access to Visual Arts Education: Printmaking Studio Enhancement

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: 

96
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$29,781

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,781

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-organized and -developed proposal. The PI's record of achievement supports the panel's view that the project will greatly enhance instruction and add to the overall reputation of the institution as an important center for the arts. The panel recommends full funding of \$29,781 for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nathan Hutchings

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Anatomy Laboratory Enhancement for Allied Health Students

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 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 20 (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: 

94
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$26,899  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$26,899

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.)

Louisiana State University-Shreveport requests funds to purchase anatomical models and interactive anatomy computer modules to enhance and enrich learning experiences in the anatomy laboratory, also known as the physiology laboratory. Northeast Louisiana alone is expected to experience a 30.9% increase in the demand for allied health personnel between 2000 and 2010. This new approach will alleviate the dependency on costly animal dissections; precise replicas of human anatomy should prove to be more feasible and less expensive. Matching support for this proposal is an impressive institutional match of \$12,352. The panel recommends full funding for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Timothy Winter

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nutritional Science Enhancement

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: 

99
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$42,684  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,684

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.)

LSU-Shreveport wishes to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of nutritional science instruction by incorporating new technology and innovative nutritional science-related resources into its curricular offerings for some 900 students. The requested educational resources would also lead to more students who desire participation in faculty-led research, especially in human bioenergetics. National health goals (Healthy People 2010) list increasing healthy nutrition habits as an objective. The additional funding sources are significant. Nevertheless, the panel recommends eliminating professional travel (\$2,000) from the budget. The funding recommended for this excellent project is thus \$40,684. The institutional match should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Georgia Gresham

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Media Instruction and Computer Assisted Design Lab

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 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 \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

88
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$54,540  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,905

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 would substantially enhance the design program by providing state-of-the art CAD. It would also provide funds for a technology-enhanced presentation station for faculty. The need for the equipment has been documented. The proposal is weakened, however, because there is no discussion of the number of students to be affected, nor is there an adequate evaluation section. Nevertheless, the panel recommends partial funding of \$40,905. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alicia Hansen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Arts in the City: Promoting Fine Arts in New Orleans

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)  
 C.2 0 (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 5 (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 3 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 3 (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 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 47 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$23,500  
 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 support for technology-enhanced kiosks which will be placed in strategic places to provide information about arts organizations and programming. The panel agrees with several of the assumptions motivating the proposal: the need for technology training for arts students, the need for innovative marketing, and the importance of partnerships. However, this proposal is not sufficiently developed to be recommended for funding. There is no evidence that this technology, given its placement on sites of arts venues, will draw a new audience. Nor is there any evidence that students will in fact maintain and update the kiosks since their doing so does not seem to be tied specifically to their programs of study. In fact, there is no indication of an available infrastructure to support the kiosks. The panel does not recommend funding at this time, but does suggest that the proposal be refined for submission in the future.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William J. Kitchens

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Digital Printmaking Media in the Department of Visual Arts

## 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: 

96
----

 (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 20 (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,588

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$67,588

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 excellent proposal. The goals and objectives are clearly and appropriately developed. In light of the carefully developed Enhancement Plan, the PI's strong record of achievement, and the institution's tradition of excellence in the practice and presentation of the visual arts, the panel recommends full funding of this worthy project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026UG-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: D. Andrew Knight

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Chromatography Suite for Drug Design and Purification at Loyola University New Orleans

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. 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: 

98
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$58,026

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$58,026

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.)

Loyola's Department of Chemistry seeks funds to upgrade its chromatography equipment in order to better prepare students for medicinal or pharmaceutical chemistry. Improved hands-on experience in the use of liquid chromatography is vital to chemistry students in light of new technology and instructional revisions, including suggested instructional revisions in the organic chemistry laboratory sequence. High pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) will significantly improve teaching dynamics in drug design, pharmaceutical synthesis, etc. An improved chemical curricula will also increase the PI's national competitiveness in grantsmanship as well as student interest. Loyola will contribute \$46,330. Full funding for this project is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027UG-07

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kenneth Baskin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Three Dimensional Ceramics Area Enhancement

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

77
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,655  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$24,289

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 seeks to enhance the 3-D section of the instructional arts program. The objectives are clear and reasonable. The project is commendable for its focus on the three-dimensional mixed media arts. However, more emphasis should have been placed on the impact and possible future direction of the program. The panel recommends partial funding of \$24,289 for this project. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raj Boopathy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Environmental Biology Education at Nicholls State University

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
B.6 0 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

65
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,128

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.)

Biological Sciences students need up-to-date analytical instruments and their faculty need PowerPoint presentation capabilities for lectures. The proposal cites numerous uses for such technologies in environmental biology and related biology courses. The equipment requested is for biological and chemical analysis and for slides lectures. However, the proposal appears to be better suited to the biological sciences than to the earth sciences. The panel believes that PowerPoint capability should be a basic component of university equipment, but should not be used to address reforms in science teaching identified by the National Academy of Sciences. This proposal should be restructured and resubmitted in another year when biological sciences is eligible. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jeff Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technological Advancement Within the Ceramics 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 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 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 14 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 0 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (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: \$33,045  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$24,783

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 project focuses on expanding instruction in ceramics in the Department of Art. The faculty is most timely in efforts to utilize new technologies with traditional artistic practices. The goal and objectives are presented well, and proposal is well grounded. The panel recommends partial funding (\$24,783). Budget reductions may be made at the discretion of the PIs. The institutional match for installation may be reduced, but not that for laboratory construction (\$55,000).

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Celdrick Course

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Cytotechnology Microscopic and Lecture-Guided Equipment

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 12 (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 8 (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 69 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$69,042

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 cytotechnology program in the Allied Health Sciences proposes to augment its lecture-guided equipment with a state-of-the-art multiheaded instructional microscope, student microscopes, a multimedia projector, a laptop computer, and other necessary hardware. The equipment will provide student/faculty interaction during instruction, facilitate research projects, and improve the performance of students/graduates in clinical practicums at six regional clinical institutions. Nicholls is one of only 48 institutions that train cytotechnologists. The B.S. degree in Health Sciences, with an alternate admissions pathway for cytotechnology students, began in 1997 and is accredited. Despite these seemingly positive aspects of the proposal, the panel cannot justify the almost \$70,000 requested to benefit only four students. The proposal is not cost effective.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michelle Dufrene

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Engaged Mind: The Benefits of Wireless Student Response Systems in the Classroom

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: 

97
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$15,804

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$15,804

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

The Department of Nursing is requesting funding for the Wireless Student Response system to improve lectures by obtaining real-time student responses to assist the instructor and students' learning. The WSP is recognized as a useful way to improve large-class lectures, increase the level of student engagement, and encourage faculty to innovate during lectures. The panel recommends full funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amanda S. Eymard

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of BSN Nursing Curriculum with the GAC (Geriatrics Across Curriculum) Project

## 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)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

92
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$23,545

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$23,545

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.)

Nicholls' Department of Nursing seeks to enhance its curriculum with a geriatrics component in hopes of promoting confidence in students who care for geriatric clients in healthcare settings. The clinical laboratory equipment requested will permit simulation of common disabilities associated with the elderly. Currently there is little or no geriatric equipment (patient care mannequins, simulation equipment) in clinical laboratories. The proposal's goals/objectives are justified. Several area hospitals and healthcare facilities have pledged financial support for this project, and private contributions will assist in implementing it. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia M. Lamberty

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Going for the Green

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 9 (of 20 points)  
B.3 10 (of 25 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 3 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

67
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$33,632

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 applicant requests funding to move students from micro-scale to small-scale "green chemistry" to increase their knowledge of "environmentally benign" chemical processes and results, which is a well-described student learning need. Although this new design is an important student learning adjustment, its connection with environmental impacts is not only in awareness, but also in improvement. The proposal's relationship to the Earth/Environmental Sciences categorization is rather tenuous. The panel recommends resubmission under Chemistry in another year. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tim Mead

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Health and Wellness Programs at Nicholls State University

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 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 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 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: 

93
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$26,889

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$26,889

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 needs funds to augment the current Health and Development program with additional exercise equipment conducive to helping people with differing types of disabilities. The program matches students and area seniors in fitness activities in a structured sequence. The faculty has the appropriate mix of expertise to address both physical education and fitness. The program can reduce health costs in the region with appropriate interventions, both directly and attitudinally. The panel recommends full funding for this worthy project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Biology Laboratory Experiences for Health Science Majors

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (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 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

68
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$54,235

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 was designed to enhance students' laboratory experiences in General Biology I through purchase of new/updated equipment. The equipment will also service the needs/desires of some upper-level courses. Of the approximately 600 undergraduate biology majors, more than half plan to pursue a career in the health sciences (medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, physician assistant, etc). Also, it is claimed that the requested upgrade in equipment and supplies will further curricular aspirations in line with the revamping of General Biology I in 1996 and the recent acquisition of new faculty (of the 17 tenured/tenure track faculty, 7 earned the doctorate in the past 10 years). However, the absence of additional funding sources indicates a lack of institutional support for this particular project. The panel cannot recommend funding for this project this year, but does recommend that funding for this proposal be sought elsewhere.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rajkumar Nathaniel

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Clinical Laboratory Experiences for Health Science Students

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

69
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$30,000

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 proposed goal of this project is to provide nationally competitive academic experiences for health science students in biology by giving them "cutting edge" instrumentation and technologies for clinical public health and to support the faculty's research applications. It is claimed that state-of-the-art equipment is needed for young and vigorous faculty whose interests include research as well as teaching. However, the applicant stated that additional funding sources "do not apply," which indicates that this project is not an institutional priority. The panel suggests that the applicant seek funds other than BoRSF dollars to support the project. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gerard White

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Increasing Student Access to State-of-the-Art Therapeutic Equipment for the Attainment of Educational Competencies and Clinical Proficiencies to Enhance Professional Preparation

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

65
----

 (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 13 (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 6 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$33,776

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 equipment requested is better suited to fitness programs than to allied health disciplines. The PI and Co-PI have backgrounds in athletic training, further indicating that students and faculty alike will have access to their teaching about therapeutics (e.g., what to do for a pulled muscle). Neither professional has indicated any outside funding for such equipment, nor have they indicated that they have sought such funding. It is recommended that other sources be approached to underwrite this holistic, umbrella program for allied health faculty and students.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038UG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Williams-Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Nursing Students' Learning Through Maternal-Child Simulation Technology

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)  
C.2 0 (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 6 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 

90
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$21,907  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$21,907

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 baccalaureate nursing program faculty at Nicholls seeks funds to enhance nursing students' learning through maternal-child simulation technology. The maternal and neonatal computer interactive simulator is a life-size, interactive neonate mannequin with one birthing baby; it provides a variety of clinical nursing procedures/applications. Acquisition of this model would present the students with more realistic clinical scenarios and enhance their knowledge and psychomotor learning, which is critical to birthing and neonatal care, but without imminent danger to an actual maternal patient. Current static, partial mannequins are obsolete. Faculty are well qualified to succeed with this project and the department will support it financially. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039UG-07

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Matthew D. DeFord

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Purchase for the Enhancement of Ceramic Studies

## 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 1 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 4 (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 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 12 (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 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: \$13,915  
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 Visual Arts unit of the School of Creative and Performing Arts is commended for its designation as an Area of Excellence by the Board of Regents and its accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). However, the proposal's enhancement plan and rationale explaining the potential impact of this project should have been developed further. For example, there is no explanation of how the new equipment will "increase the quality of students' artistic outputs compatible to national norms" or how the equipment purchase will "elevate Ceramic Studies instruction toward the exploration of clay as sculpture and not just clay as utilitarian craft objects." More specific information and data are required to make claims such as these more convincing. The panel does not recommend funding for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040UG-07

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zafer Hatahet

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Set Up of Modern Genetics and Molecular Biology Laboratories

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

81
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$125,008  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$112,508

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.)

A curriculum review committee at Northwestern State University has made the study of genetics mandatory for all biology majors; the integration of genetics and molecular biology laboratories formalizes this curricular adjustment. The Biological Sciences Department faculty is now enthusiastic about creating an "integrated (sequence) curriculum" in which each course will build significantly on knowledge gained in previous courses, thus creating a pipeline of critical information necessary for student learning of the genetics and molecular biology required for the undergraduate degree. NSU matching funds are committed to support this program improvement, and a proposal to the National Science Foundation is pending. However, the panel does not recommend fully funding the proposal at this time due to the limited funds available in this program. An award of \$112,508 should provide some of the equipment necessary to successfully integrate the two laboratories. Reductions may be made at the PI's discretion, and matching funds may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paula S. Currie

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology for Clinical Education

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (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 20 (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 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: 

92
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$70,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$70,000

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 SLU Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders seeks to install a state-of-the art, fully automated monitoring and recording system in the Speech-Language-Hearing Clinic for students' undergraduate and graduate clinical education relating to a variety of communication disorders. Acquisition of this technology will strengthen the graduate program's application for re-accreditation. Students must graduate from an accredited program in order to be eligible for national certification. Current equipment is outdated and economically impractical. Institutional support for the project is a substantial pledge of \$70,000. It is noted, also, that no funds for the PI and support personnel are requested. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Evenson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Electronic Piano Lab

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

92
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$50,112  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,112

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

This proposal requests support to substantially enhance the electronic piano lab because the current lab is in disrepair and inadequate. This project appears essential to the maintenance of the music program. Electronic piano labs have proven to be the most efficient and cost-effective way to provide piano instruction. In addition, the university has opened its facility to the local elementary school system to enhance its ability to provide music instruction. This is a particularly strong proposal because the need is so clearly demonstrated. The panel recommends full funding

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer J. Jeansonne

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening Our Exercise Science and Athletic Training Labs and Classes with Equipment for Training, Rehabilitating, and Preventing Injury in Preparation for Health and Kinesiology

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

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 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 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: \$140,807

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$105,605

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 applicant requests physical training equipment to assist students' understanding of human movement and develop skills essential for health-and-movement science-related fields. The requested equipment will also support the accreditation process. Other state universities provide this equipment; SLU's students deserve equipment of equal quality. The panel recommends that the PI determine the best way to reduce the budget to the recommended award level of \$105,605. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynda Katz

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition, Storage, and Delivery of Digital Images for the Art History and Studio Art Curricula

## 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 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 

74
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$75,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$37,000

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.)

Increasing use of digital technologies in the instructional program in art history is a timely and laudable goal. Even though the rationale and enhancement plan are reasonably well developed, both need further exposition and amplification. Nevertheless, the panel recommends partial support of \$37,000 for this project. The PIs have full discretion to choose which items to delete from the budget. The institutional match may be reduced by approximately one-half.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 045UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barbara Moffett

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mentoring on Demand: Bridging the Gap for New and Part-time Faculty

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 98 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$49,241  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$49,241

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 clinical faculty in Southeastern's School of Nursing are frequently assigned to healthcare facilities away from the academic/clinical campuses in Hammond and Baton Rouge, often in remote sites with few or no other faculty for support or direct mentoring. While clinically proficient, these full- or part-time faculty members need assistance in the development of the "teaching faculty" role and consistently require orientation to (new) course objectives, course requirements, and use of clinical evaluation methods and tools; this situation often creates challenges for administrators and course coordinators to ensure quality learning experiences and fair assessments of student progress.

The goal of the mentoring project is to develop teacher/learning modules for the development of new and part-time clinical faculty that can be accessed at times convenient for the individual faculty member. Modules will include development of narrative, slides, and audio/video clips. Mentoring will also be offered through on-line discussion boards via the course management system. Full funding for this worthy project is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 046UG-07

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Valentino

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southeastern's Digital Sculpture Initiative

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

85
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$97,459  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$73,094

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 makes a strong case by building upon the substantial work previously accomplished by faculty in the area of arts (sculpture) technology. The department serves a large number of students, and the number of faculty members is increasing. The panel recommends partial support of \$73,094 for this project. Budget cuts may be made at the discretion of the PIs, and the institutional match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award amount.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 047UG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sudipta Das

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Fine Arts Academic Infrastructure by Providing Equipment and Technology

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

96
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 \_\_\_\_\_ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$24,951  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$24,951

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

This proposal requests funding to support basic studio arts equipment and computers. The panel appreciates the need for replacement materials after the devastation of Hurricane Katrina. While in a "normal" time this request would be more appropriate for a university operating budget, clearly all funding sources are needed to restore departments to pre-Katrina levels. The panel recommends full funding.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 048UG-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jessica Dolecheck

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Comprehensive BSHS Faculty Enhancement

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 0 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 15 (of 20 points)  
B.3 15 (of 25 points)  
B.4 5 (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 0 (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

**G. Total Score:** 61 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$55,800

**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.)

It is difficult to evaluate a program that does not yet exist. Moreover, is it the responsibility of the BoRSF to fund new programs, or is it the responsibility of the requesting institution? The application indicates that (start-up) travel is nonexistent for most public education institutions due to cutbacks in travel funds and because funds are badly needed to repair hurricane damage. The panel, however, notes that the proposed budget has no specific line item request for travel. Finally, although seeking funds for faculty enhancement to start a new course may seem plausible, is it the responsibility of the BoR to underwrite this effort? The panel thinks not. No funding is recommended.

# Appendix A

## Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Undergraduate Enhancement Program  
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>001UG-07 HEA</b>	Training for Pharmacy Technicians	Bossier Parish Community College (Pharmacy Technician);	Terri Mundi;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 42,409</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 42,409</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>002UG-07 ART</b>	Music for the Movies	Centenary College (Music);	Douglas Rust;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 35,957</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 35,957</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

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

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>003UG-07 ART</b>	Printmaking and Learning Laboratory (P.A.L.L.)	Dillard University (Visual Arts);	John Barnes; Amy Bryan; Charles Hollingsworth; Danille Taylor; Sally Heller;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 58,549</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 58,549</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>004UG-07 HEA</b>	Project: Supplement Instructions in Health and Medical Sciences	Dillard University (Student Support Services);	Kevin J. Bastian; Carlen L. McLin;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 72,487</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,487</b>
<b>N</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>005UG-07 EAR</b>	Enhancement of the Computerized Earth Science Instruction at Dillard University	Dillard University (Biology);	Ruby L. Broadway; Zujia Xu;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 72,306</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,306</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>006UG-07 ENG A</b>	Enhancement of Instruction in Pre-engineering	Dillard University (Biology);	Ruby L. Broadway; Abdalla Darwish;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 93,235</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 93,235</b>
<b>N</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>007UG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancing the Undergraduate Agricultural Sciences Initiative Through Instruction and Research	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Sonya Caston; Gail Goynes Ceasar; Gloria C. Love; Lovell E. Agwaramgbo; Valerie L. Epps;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 119,588</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 119,588</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>008UG-07 ART</b>	The "Hollywood-South Project": Developing a Multimedia Interdisciplinary-Curriculum Center (ICC) Subsequent to the Impact of the Film Industry's Invasion of Louisiana.	Dillard University (Theatre);	Cortheal M. Clark; Edward Anderson; Ray Vrazel; Sherri Mariana;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 189,396</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 189,396</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>009UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Pre-Nursing Education	Dillard University (Nursing);	Betty P. Dennis; Charlotte Hurst; Denise Young; Jacqueline Hogan; Yolanda Powell Young;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 80,320</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 80,320</b>
N Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>010UG-07 EAR</b>	Environmental Sciences Education Enhancement Program (ESEEP)	Dillard University (Biology);	Jose Ramirez Domenech; Bernard Singleton; Wadajo Welldaregay;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 78,176</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 78,176</b>
N Proposal is a <b>Continuation Request</b> Previous Contract: LEQSF(2004-05)-ENH-UG-18					
<b>011UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Instruction Through Technology in Nursing with PDAS: The Point-of-Care (POC) Project	Dillard University (Nursing);	Charlotte S. Hurst; Azubike Okpalaez; Betty P. Dennis; Gloria C. Love; Ora L. Mondy;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 97,429</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 97,429</b>
E Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>012UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Public Health Curriculum and Instruction Through the Public Health Dry Laboratory	Dillard University (Public Helath);	Carlen L. McLin; Dawn Williams; Veronica White; Wodajo Welldaregay;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 82,679</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 82,679</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>013UG-07 EAR</b>	Enhancement of Computational Environmental Science Instruction and Research	Dillard University (Computer Science);	Zujia Xu; Azubike Okpalaeze;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 98,094</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 98,094</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>014UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Student Resources in Health Sciences	Grambling State University (Library Services);	Rosemary Mokia; Rhonda Rolon;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 221,104</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 221,104</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>015UG-07 HEA</b>	Athletic Training Educational Curriculum Enhancement and Future Graduate Education Through the Addition of Therapeutic Modality and Rehabilitation Equipment and the Addition of a New Cadaver Laboratory	Louisiana College (Health and Physical Education);	Mike Brunet; Wade Warren;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 92,282</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 92,282</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>016UG-07 HEA</b>	Equipment to Enhance the Clinical Laboratory Science Program	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria (Allied Health);	Sheryl Herring; Cathy Robinson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 101,256</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 101,256</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>017UG-07 ART</b>	Black Box Theatre	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Drama/Theatre);	Robert Alford; Lawrence Anderson; Mary Jarzabek;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 43,770</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 43,770</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>018UG-07 ENG A</b>	Technology Upgrade to Enhance Undergraduate Courses in Microprocessor and Instrumentation Electronics	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Engineering);	Gary Boucher;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 16,860</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,860</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>019UG-07 EAR</b>	Enhancement of Experiential Learning in Environmental Science at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Dalton R. Gossett; Stephen W. Banks;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 27,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 27,000</b>
<b>N</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>020UG-07 ART</b>	Broadening Access to Visual Arts Education: Printmaking Studio Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Fine Arts, Foreign Languages and Humanities);	R. Michael Graham; John S. Vassar; M. LaMoyne Batten;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 29,781</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 29,781</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>021UG-07 HEA</b>	Anatomy Laboratory Enhancement for Allied Health Students	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Nathan Hutchings; Tara Willilams- Hart; Terry S. LeGrand;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 26,899</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,899</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>022UG-07 HEA</b>	Nutritional Science Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Kinesiology & Health Sciences);	Timothy Winter; Jesse Demello; Mary Hawkins; Ron Byrd;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 42,684</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 42,684</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>023UG-07 ART</b>	Media Instruction and Computer Assisted Design Lab	Loyola University New Orleans (Theatre Arts and Dance);	Georgia Gresham; Joseph Harris;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 54,540</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 54,540</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>024UG-07 ART</b>	Arts in the City: Promoting Fine Arts in New Orleans	Loyola University New Orleans (Monroe Library);	Alicia Hansen; Brad Petifils;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 23,500</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,500</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>025UG-07 ART</b>	Enhancement of the Digital Printmaking Media in the Department of Visual Arts	Loyola University New Orleans (Visual Arts);	William J. Kitchens;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 67,588</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 67,588</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>026UG-07 HEA</b>	A Chromatography Suite for Drug Design and Purification at Loyola University New Orleans	Loyola University New Orleans (Chemistry);	D. Andrew Knight; William Walkenhorst;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 58,026</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 58,026</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>027UG-07 ART</b>	Three Dimensional Ceramics Area Enhancement	McNeese State University (Visual Arts);	Kenneth Baskin; Bridget V. McDaniel; Lynn Reynolds;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 53,655</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 53,655</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>028UG-07 EAR</b>	Enhancement of Environmental Biology Education at Nicholls State University	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Raj Boopathy; Enmin Zou; Gary LeFleur; John Doucet;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 60,128</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 60,128</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>029UG-07 ART</b>	Technological Advancement Within the Ceramics Laboratory	Nicholls State University (Art);	Jeff Brown; Jean Donegan;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 33,045</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,045</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>030UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Cytotechnology Microscopic and Lecture-Guided Equipment	Nicholls State University (Allied Health);	Celdrick Course; David Gyer; Teddy P. Dupre, Jr.;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 69,042</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 69,042</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>031UG-07 HEA</b>	The Engaged Mind: The Benefits of Wireless Student Response Systems in the Classroom	Nicholls State University (Nursing);	Michelle Dufrene; Adrienne Bethancourt; Bridgette Dufrene;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 15,804</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,804</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>032UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of BSN Nursing Curriculum with the GAC (Geriatrics Across Curriculum) Project	Nicholls State University (Nursing);	Amanda S. Eymard; Brandi Crawford; Kellie Graffagnino; Rebecca Lyons; Sue Velma Westbrook; Susan Dupre; Thomas Smith; Todd Keller;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 23,545</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,545</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>033UG-07 EAR</b>	Going for the Green	Nicholls State University (Physical Sciences);	Cynthia M. Lamberty;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 33,632</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,632</b>
<b>N</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>034UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing the Health and Wellness Programs at Nicholls State University	Nicholls State University (Health and Physical Education);	Tim Mead; Angela Hammerli; Arrianna Smith; Dennis Guillot; Kim Brannagan;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 26,889</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 26,889</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>035UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Biology Laboratory Experiences for Health Science Majors	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Rajkumar Nathaniel; David L. Schultz;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 54,235</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 54,235</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>036UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancing Clinical Laboratory Experiences for Health Science Students	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Rajkumar Nathaniel; Angela Corbin; Raj Boopathy;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 30,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 30,000</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>037UG-07 HEA</b>	Increasing Student Access to State-of-the-Art Therapeutic Equipment for the Attainment of Educational Competencies and Clinical Proficiencies to Enhance Professional Preparation	Nicholls State University (Allied Health Sciences);	Gerard White; Celestine Weuve;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 33,776</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 33,776</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>038UG-07 HEA</b>	Enhancement of Nursing Students' Learning Through Maternal-Child Simulation Technology	Nicholls State University (Nursing);	Pamela Williams-Jones; Michelle Patterson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 21,907</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 21,907</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>039UG-07 ART</b>	Equipment Purchase for the Enhancement of Ceramic Studies	Northwestern State University (Fine Arts);	Matthew D. DeFord;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 13,915</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 13,915</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>040UG-07 HEA</b>	Set Up of Modern Genetics and Molecular Biology Laboratories	Northwestern State University (Biological Sciences);	Zafer Hatahet; Francene Lemoine;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 125,008</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 125,008</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>041UG-07 HEA</b>	Technology for Clinical Education	Southeastern Louisiana University (Communication Sciences and Disorders);	Paula S. Currie;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 70,000</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>042UG-07 ART</b>	Enhancement of Electronic Piano Lab	Southeastern Louisiana University (Music and Dramatic Arts);	David Evenson; Charles Effler;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 50,112</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 50,112</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>043UG-07 HEA</b>	Strengthening Our Exercise Science and Athletic Training Labs and Classes with Equipment for Training, Rehabilitating, and Preventing Injury in Preparation for Health and Kinesiology	Southeastern Louisiana University (Kinesiology and Health Studies);	Jennifer J. Jeansonne; Karen Lew;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 140,807</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 140,807</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>044UG-07 ART</b>	Acquisition, Storage, and Delivery of Digital Images for the Art History and Studio Art Curricula	Southeastern Louisiana University (Visual Arts);	Lynda Katz; Irene Nero;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 75,000</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>045UG-07 HEA</b>	Mentoring on Demand: Bridging the Gap for New and Part-time Faculty	Southeastern Louisiana University (Nursing);	Barbara Moffett;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 49,241</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,241</b>
<b>N</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>046UG-07 ART</b>	Southeastern's Digital Sculpture Initiative	Southeastern Louisiana University (Visual Arts);	John Valentino; Dale Newkirk; Jeff Mickey;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 97,459</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 97,459</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>047UG-07 ART</b>	Enhancing Fine Arts Academic Infrastructure by Providing Equipment and Technology	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Arts and Humanities);	Sudipta Das; Gary W. Oaks;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 24,951</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 24,951</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

---

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>048UG-07 HEA</b>	Comprehensive BSHS Faculty Enhancement	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Health Studies);	Jessica Dolecheck;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 55,800</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 55,800</b>

N  
 Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle</b>			
<b>Total Number of Proposals Submitted</b>	<b>Total First-Year Funds Requested</b>	<b>Total Funds Requested</b>	<b>Total First-Year Funds Available</b>
<b>48</b>	<b>\$ 3,083,866</b>	<b>\$ 3,083,866</b>	<b>\$</b>

# Appendix B

## Rating Forms

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

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 6 pts.      C.1      To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 1 pt.      C.2      Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 3 pts.      C.3      To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07  
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points**

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

No Points Given, But this is a required component B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts. D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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