

# **FY 2007-08 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS**

## **Introduction**

The Undergraduate Enhancement proposal review panel consisting of Dr. Richard Robinett, Pennsylvania State University (chair); Dr. Maureen Evans, consultant; Ms. Karen Myers, Fisher College (Boston); and Dr. Alexandru Biris, University of Arkansas Little Rock, met February 7-8, 2008, in Baton Rouge to evaluate 49 proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Undergraduate Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) 49 Undergraduate proposals to be evaluated with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2007-08 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2005 Undergraduate Enhancement review panel final report. Prior to the meeting each member read the materials, assessed the proposals, and tentatively completed the rating form for each proposal. At its meeting the panel discussed each proposal and transformed each individual tentative rating into a composite rating. Reviewers then prepared comprehensive ratings and drafted this final report. Each proposal was reviewed and discussed in detail, and reviewers believe that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP.

This report contains tables that rank all proposals, categorizing them into two groups. Table I presents a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. First-year funds requested during this funding cycle totaled \$3,450,934; the total amount of Support Funds allocated to the proposals that are recommended for funding is \$1,620,000.

Of the 49 proposals, 21 were recommended for full funding and 9 for partial funding. However, partial funding was determined only after thorough review of the budget resulting in funded amounts corresponding to the most pressing needs presented. Only those proposals with a composite score of 70 or greater were recommended for funding. The remaining 19 proposals did not score above 70 and thus were not recommended for funding.

A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

Three of the four members of this panel have reviewed Undergraduate Enhancement proposals over the last few years. Over that time we had noticed a significant increase in the quality of proposals submitted. However, this year, for whatever reasons, this was not

the case. Overall, this year's proposals were less imaginative and demonstrated less interest in outreach to local businesses and communities than in previous years. Additionally, we noticed that a few proposals did not strictly adhere to program guidelines such as proposal length, and these we advised the applicants to revise their proposals and resubmit them in another cycle

Alternatively, the panel did not consider the Support Fund to be the most appropriate funding source for other proposals. In the latter cases, the panel suggested that the proposals be submitted to more appropriate non-Support Fund funding agencies.

**TABLE I**  
**UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT**  
**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	92	034UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$90,624	\$90,624
2	89	021UG-08	DILLARD	\$79,341	\$68,697
2	89	041UG-08	SLU	\$136,905	\$136,905
4	88	008UG-08	DELGADO	\$104,258	\$92,865
4	88	030UG-08	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$63,600	\$63,600
4	88	039UG-08	SLU	\$9,218	\$9,218
7	87	001UG-08	BPCC	\$7,394	\$7,394
7	87	028UG-08	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$15,300	\$15,300
9	86	038UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$32,135	\$32,135
10	85	022UG-08	GRAMBLING	\$98,020	\$98,020
11	84	040UG-08	SLU	\$22,400	\$22,400
12	83	014UG-08	DILLARD	\$49,441	\$49,441
12	83	029UG-08	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$58,200	\$58,200
14	81	005UG-08	CENTENARY	\$16,361	\$16,361
14	81	032UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$77,646	\$77,646
16	80	012UG-08	DILLARD	\$93,626	\$93,626
16	80	031UG-08	LOYOLA	\$72,388	\$72,388
18	78	035UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$29,483	\$29,483
19	76	002UG-08	BPCC	\$60,951	\$39,858
19	76	007UG-08	DELGADO	\$38,569	\$26,142
19	76	023UG-08	LSU-ALEXANDRIA	\$15,380	\$15,380
22	75	049UG-08	XAVIER	\$88,628	\$88,628
23	72	015UG-08	DILLARD	\$95,341	\$42,000
23	72	020UG-08	DILLARD	\$74,452	\$45,000
23	72	024UG-08	LSU-ALEXANDRIA	\$97,470	\$97,470
23	72	026UG-08	LSU-ALEXANDRIA	\$22,508	\$22,508
23	72	045UG-08	SUNO	\$190,729	\$135,000
28	71	011UG-08	DILLARD	\$47,562	\$40,000
28	71	033UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$20,361	\$18,211
30	70	006UG-08	CENTENARY	\$15,500	\$15,500
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$1,823,791</b>	<b>\$1,620,000</b>

**TABLE II**  
**UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT**  
**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>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
31	68	046UG-08	SUNO	\$94,980	\$0	\$0	\$0
32	66	017UG-08	DILLARD	\$140,440	\$0	\$0	\$0
33	64	043UG-08	SUNO	\$78,138	\$0	\$0	\$0
34	62	013UG-08	DILLARD	\$73,511	\$0	\$0	\$0
35	60	019UG-08	DILLARD	\$81,345	\$0	\$0	\$0
35	60	025UG-08	LSU-ALEXANDRIA	\$134,280	\$0	\$0	\$0
35	60	027UG-08	LSU-SHREVEPORT	\$49,446	\$0	\$0	\$0
35	60	037UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$89,999	\$0	\$0	\$0
39	59	004UG-08	BPCC	\$48,903	\$0	\$8,439	\$0
40	56	010UG-08	DILLARD	\$92,064	\$0	\$0	\$0
40	56	036UG-08	NICHOLLS	\$38,024	\$0	\$0	\$0
42	55	042UG-08	SLU	\$32,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
43	54	048UG-08	XAVIER	\$306,900	\$0	\$0	\$0
44	50	016UG-08	DILLARD	\$65,700	\$0	\$0	\$0
45	43	003UG-08	BPCC	\$29,438	\$0	\$0	\$0
46	42	047UG-08	SUNO	\$58,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
47	36	009UG-08	DILLARD	\$99,071	\$0	\$0	\$0
48	35	044UG-08	SUNO	\$59,976	\$0	\$0	\$0
49	29	018UG-08	DILLARD	\$54,928	\$0	\$0	\$0
			<b>TOTALS:</b>	<b>\$1,627,143</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$8,439</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-08

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Densmore

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computers for Enhancing Instruction in Development  
Mathematics

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)  
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)  
 C.3 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 8 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 17 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: \$7,394  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$7,394

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 Bossier Parish Community College proposal expands on a previously funded BoR award. That project was successful in enhancing instruction in developmental mathematics classes. The PI's goal with this proposal is to increase the number of eligible students who will derive the benefit of being able to enroll in more than one developmental math course in a semester, thus expediting the length of time it takes for them to complete their degree program. The panel recommends full funding of \$7,394 for this modest project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-08

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Densmore

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using Technology and Manipulatives to Improve the  
Preparation of Future Elementary Teachers

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1     2     (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$60,951    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$39,858    </u>

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

This project could have a significant impact on the mathematical teaching skills of prospective elementary education teachers. The extensive list of manipulatives requested will provide teacher candidates with invaluable experiences prior to student teaching. The panel recommends partial funding of \$39,858 by reducing the equipment request by about one-third, retaining all of the manipulatives (Teaching Materials, lists 1 and 2), and deleting the tables, chairs and cabinet from the requested supplies. The full institutional match should be honored nevertheless.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-08

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pam Milstead

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology = Success for Business Students

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 43 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   2   (of 5 points)  
 B.2   8   (of 15 points)  
 B.3   8   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   2   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   1   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  10  (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   1   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount:   \$29,438    
**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 PI for "Technology = Success for Business Students" requests equipment and software to add to a significant number of computers and equipment already currently available in five lecture rooms and seven computer labs for BPCC student use. The panel believes that the proposal contained little compelling justification for how the additional equipment to be purchased would affect the goals and "success" of business students, how the additional equipment would meet the goals of this project, or how student outcomes would be affected by the infusion of more technology. In light of other pressing needs across the State, no funding is recommended for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-08

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barbara Poole

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Transformation of Developmental Math: Student Success  
and Engagement

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 59 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     1     (of 5 points)  
 B.2     8     (of 15 points)  
 B.3    12    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     2     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     1     (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.)

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>		
<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$48,903</u>	<u>\$8,439</u>
<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This BPCC proposal is identified as primarily an equipment request. However, the bulk of the narrative (which exceeds by 10 pages the 15-page limit) relates to the content and instructional methodology of three developmental math courses and the detailed plans for testing them. Yet, surprisingly, the budget explanation centers more on need for software, furniture, and some supplies (even copy paper for \$2,500) for an advising center that the panel believes is only tangential to the narrative description and goals. Therefore, we do not recommend funding this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-08

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joshua D. Lawrence

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer-aided Peer Instruction and Real-time Evaluation  
of Student Learning in Chemistry and Physics Classes

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    14    (of 15 points)  
 B.3    16    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     2     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     3     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes     x     No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    12    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     4     (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No     x    

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount:     \$16,361      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount:     \$16,361    

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 from Centenary College is well written; the PI highlighted the need for computer-aided peer instruction and real-time evaluation of students in Chemistry and Physics classes. Since the proposal contained clearly defined goals and a well-developed enhancement plan, the panel recommends full funding of \$16,361 for the project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006UG-08

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Juan Rodriguez

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Physics Education with Research Experiences  
Throughout the Curriculum

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   2   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  13   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  17   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   3   (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   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:**   \$15,500    
**RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:**   \$15,500  

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 to purchase an IR camera for use by Centenary College faculty and students in course-related projects, undergraduate research, and applications to "discover-science" type activities is a reasonable one. The equipment requested is a good compromise in quality versus price and can be used in a variety of settings, including possible collaborations with external industrial partners. The PI has ample background to be able to train others in the use of the instrument. Although the need is clear, a suggestion would be to involve even more faculty members in the training process. Given the modest cost of the proposal, the panel recommends full funding of \$15,500 for the project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-08

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rene' Cintron

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Classroom Management System

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  13   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  18   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   1   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  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  

H. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$38,569  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$26,142  </u>

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

Delgado Community College's "Computer Classroom Management System" proposal requests conversion of a current classroom into a computer-training center with 20 Dell Inspirons and a Smartboard for this American Academy of College Schools of Business (AACSB) institution. The panel recommends \$26,142 in partial funding for the upgrade and equipment, but no funding for the chairs, desks, or the classroom-management software. The latter item should be unnecessary for students at this advanced education level. The institutional match should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-08

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Marilyn G. Ciolina

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Delgado Accounting Computer Lab

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**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   8   (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  14   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  18   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  12   (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   2   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$104,258    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$92,865  

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.)

Delgado's Accounting Computer Lab proposal requests equipment to create a dedicated accounting lab for students who lack computer classrooms. The PI promises a 24 percent increase in retention when more accounting classes can be offered each year. The panel recommends partial funding of \$92,865 for equipment, software, installation, but does not recommend funding for furniture (chairs and two desks). The institutional match should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruby Broadway

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Instruction Pre-Engineering

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   10   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1   0   (of 2 points)  
 D.2a        (For S/E)  
 or        (of 10 points)  
 D.2b   3   (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   3   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score:**   36   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$99,071  

**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 outlines a well-intentioned attempt to increase Dillard student interest in science- and engineering-related majors. The panel believes, however, that the broad mix of initiatives (including activities in mathematics, engineering, communication skills, English, computing, etc.) is inappropriate for a Physics proposal. The nature of the program made it unclear as to how the program would survive in the long term. Several weaknesses were observed: the budget and the narrative request did not match, the enhancement plan lacked details about how the program would be implemented, and the assessment plan lacked focus. Additionally, many similarities in these weaknesses that the panel has just identified were noted between the current proposal and an unfunded one submitted during the previous cycle. Thus, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Janice Burrell-Pinera

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing an Institute for Academic Achievement (IA2)

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 56 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$92,064    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**       \$0      

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

This proposal to select 45 Dillard University students for a one-year experimental summer research institute and mentoring program to better prepare them for graduate study and the workforce is not recommended for funding. Dillard has a comprehensive and structured program of student enhancement services, and the panel hopes that the noble goal of this proposal can be incorporated into existing services by articulating the mentoring and counseling goals in more specific and measurable terms and outcomes.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonya L. Caston

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Instrumental Analysis Laboratory for 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 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 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 9 (of 20 points)  
B.4 3 (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 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

71
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$47,562  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,000

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 is recommended for partial funding of \$40,000. Since there is no explanation about how the extensive glassware component being requested is connected to the FLS instrument, the reduction should be reflected in the glassware budget, which should be reduced from \$10,000 to \$2,438. Despite the recommendation of a reduced budget, Dillard University should maintain the match in full in order for the project to be successful.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kim M. Coleman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ABLE Business Center

**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: 80 (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  19  (of 20 points)  
 B.4   2  (of 5 points)  
 B.5   1  (of 2 points)  
 B.6   1  (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 \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$93,626    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$93,626  

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 recommends full funding (\$93,626) for a Dillard University student-operated, profit-generating reproduction center for economics/finance students to achieve on-the-job training in human resource management, organizational behavior, finance, economics, management, marketing, and accounting. The A.B.L.E. Center, conceived as an Applied Business Laboratory Executive enhancement to the curriculum, is expected to generate interrelated, applied business projects for six courses: Micro, Macro, Banking, Urban Economics, Leadership Ethics, and Managerial Economics. The PI has done a good job of providing well-established benchmarks, and the panel believes that this project will enhance student outcomes.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kim M. Coleman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ABLE Conference

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   12   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**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   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   1   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   1   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   2   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**G. Total Score:**   62   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$73,511    
**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.)

Using the outcomes of the A.B.L.E. program enhancement (see also proposal 012-UG-08), the P.I. requests \$73,511 to host an A.B.L.E. conference relating to best practices in applied business training. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal now, but does suggest that once the A.B.L.E. program has succeeded, the PI could resubmit this proposal and include appropriate assessment measures such as student outcomes, profitability information, and the like.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kim M. Coleman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ABLE Training 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   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 \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b  10   (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  15   (of 15 points)  
 B.3  18   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   1   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   1   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   1   (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   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:**   \$49,441    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**   \$49,441  

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.)

Using the A.B.L.E. program as the base (see also proposals 012UG-08 and 013UG-08), funds are recommended for computers, AV equipment, and software for project participants to create four annual A.B.L.E. training modules on DVDs as service-learning partnerships for community development in an effort to create "a surge of local business activity" in Dillard's service area. The video camcorders, notebook computers and other equipment will be utilized to produce four years of training modules to be used in multiple courses for 75 students and the community. Full funding of \$49,441 is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hong Dai

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Actuarial Sciences  
Phase-III (UAS-III)

**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     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     4     (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     3     (of 5 points)  
B.2    12    (of 15 points)  
B.3    13    (of 20 points)  
B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes     x     No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1     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:**     \$95,341      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**     \$42,000    

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 Dillard proposal builds quite well on two earlier, successful projects. However, the panel recommends that the proposal be funded at the reduced level of \$42,000, which should include the requested equipment, software, SOA exam books and fees, and the expenses for Actuarial Week activities. The Panel also recommends that institutional matching funds for equipment, software, and installation be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Frempong-Mireku

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Pre-Mathematics Initiatives II (EPMI-II)

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 

50
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$65,700

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposed summer mathematics institute for high school graduates is an interesting proposal from three Dillard faculty members, but the panel is unconvinced that it will accomplish the desired goals of developing students' proficiency in analytical and logical thinking. Additionally, the proposal presented the panel with the question of sustainability: how will the institute be funded in future years? Based on the lack of evidence for a compelling case in these two areas, the panel does not recommend funding for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christian V. Fugar

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing International Business and World Languages  
Education

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 66 (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  11  (of 20 points)  
 B.4   4  (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2  (of 2 points)  
 B.6   2  (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1   6   (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   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:   \$140,440    
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:   \$0  

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

The request to enhance international business and world languages education at Dillard University by creating an integrated video conference center as a method of instruction for 1,000 students in French, Japanese, Spanish and Chinese is not recommended for funding at this time. Before resubmitting the proposal in another cycle, the panel suggests that the PI establish measurable outcomes for assessing the value of the project in an effort to validate program benefits.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gloria C. Love

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Digital Cultures Across the Curriculum

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   10   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   0   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score:**   29   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$54,928  

**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.)

Although this Dillard project to enhance cultures digitally through surveys and workshops is an interesting concept, the goals of the proposal need considerably greater clarity and focus. The benefits to the students have not been expressed clearly, and the enhancement plan is not well developed. Funding for the project is not recommended because of these uncertainties.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gloria C. Love

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mathematics Instruction: Enhanced Across the Curriculum

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

60
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 8 (of 15 points)  
B.3 10 (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: \$81,345  
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 would be greatly enhanced by a more specific approach to discussion of the measurement of student outcomes primarily through purchase of 35 graphing calculators, 10 overhead assemblers, and 52 computers. The panel suggests that the PIs establish performance indicators/measures prior to implementation of a project. The panel does not recommend funding for this project as it is written.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Mitchell

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instructional Enhancement for General Chemistry Laboratory (IEGCL)

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)  
E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b 7 (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 16 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
B.6 1 (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 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No x

H. Total Score: 

72
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$74,452  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$45,000

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 is recommended for \$45,000 in partial funding. Although the proposal expressed a clear need for the online video lectures/laboratory demonstrations and the use of Blackboard with electronic student-faculty interactions, it failed to explain the need for the items listed in section G, such as lab equipment and copying/telephone, and thus the panel recommends that all items in that section be eliminated. Despite the reduced budget recommendation, Dillard should maintain the institutional match in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-08

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kemberly A. Washington

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Small Business and Accounting Center in the Division of Business

**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            (For S/E)  
 or            (of 10 points)  
 D.2b    10    (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    19    (of 25 points)  
 B.4     5     (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            No           x          

**G. Total Score:** 89 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$79,341    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$68,697    </u>

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

This Dillard proposal is a laudable request to provide equipment and software to continue expansion of an existing program in which approximately 176 students gain real-world experience by providing bookkeeping, payroll, accounting, and tax-preparation services to small businesses in metropolitan New Orleans. The panel recommends partial funding of \$68,697 for the project. Funds for furniture and software training should not be provided. The latter item is available from the vendor free of charge. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-08

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pia R. Albuquerque

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Accessory Equipment to Enhance Grambling  
State University Chemistry Labs

## 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 \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b 6 (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 15 (of 15 points)  
B.3 16 (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 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: \$98,020

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$98,020

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

This proposal is recommended for full funding of \$98,020. It is extremely well written and possesses very clear goals and a strong enhancement plan. The proposal also contained good outreach and collaboration plans. Acquisition of the requested equipment should improve the educational and research goals and thus the quality of student outcomes in the Chemistry laboratories at Grambling State University.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John R. Allen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Analytical Balances for Upper Level Chemistry Courses

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## 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 8 (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 11 (of 20 points)  
B.4 3 (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 3 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No x

H. Total Score: 

76
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$15,380  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$15,380

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

This proposal is recommended for full funding (\$15,308). The case that the requested funds are truly needed by LSU-Alexandria was made succinctly and convincingly. Additionally, the proposal had clearly defined goals and a well-developed enhancement plan.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tommy Awtry

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Computer Center Acquisition

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   3   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  12  (of 15 points)  
 B.3  15  (of 20 points)  
 B.4   2  (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   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$97,470    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**   \$97,470  

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.)

Sixty laptops, two mobile laptop carts, and six access points are being requested in this proposal. The equipment will be used primarily for testing LSU-A remedial math and college algebra students using the MyMathLab software package to help increase the rate of retention. The program has several components -- quizzes, tests, and homework -- all of which students use online. The students receive immediate feedback, which in turn provides faculty with instant access to assessment data. The panel recommends full funding of \$97,470 for the project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sherry P. Bovey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Assessment Success and Educational  
Improvement with Technology

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1   2   (of 6 points)  
 C.2   1   (of 1 point)  
 C.3   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   5   (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   3   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:   \$134,280  

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:   \$0  

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

While this LSU-Alexandria proposal seeks to address one of the more challenging aspects of the collection, use, and assessment of teacher education students and clinical faculty data (UBA), the proposal lacked clarity in the strategies to be implemented to accomplish the goals. The panel suggests that the applicants focus on a few more specific goals. Funding is not recommended for this project at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gezahegn T. Chaka

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Epsilon Electrochemical Analyzer for Chemistry Curriculum

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

72
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## 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 3 (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: \$22,508

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$22,508

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.)

This proposal from LSU-Alexandria is recommended for full funding (\$22,508). Although the proposal contains a well-defined enhancement plan, it lacks discussion of how the Epsilon Electrochemical Analyzer to be purchased would be shared with other faculty members or local industry (the outreach component). Nevertheless, the panel believes that the PI has made a convincing case that the instrument will positively impact the Chemistry curriculum and research.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jerry Antee

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Math, Science, Technology, Check It Out!

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

60
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 15 points)  
B.3 12 (of 20 points)  
B.4 2 (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 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: \$49,446  
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.)

LSU-Shreveport's proposal, while offering an interesting concept, would have been significantly improved by greater collaboration with the affected school systems. How will the students fare when there is little of the technology that they have learned to use in the Ed Tech lab in their first year(s) of teaching in their own classrooms? The panel suggests that perhaps an initial pilot study would serve as a fruitful first step to the project. Funding is not recommended at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: LaWanda Blakeney

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Music Education Resource Upgrade to Serve Pre-Service Teachers

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1     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: 87 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$15,300    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$15,300    </u>

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

This excellent project is a plan to upgrade the music education laboratory equipment and software resources at LSU-Shreveport. It should have a major impact on the unit, both in terms of programs and student performance. The panel suggests that additional emphasis, however, be placed on outcomes assessment. Full funding of \$15,300 is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elahe Mahdavian

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Spectrophotometry in Biochemistry Laboratory

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

83
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$58,200  
Recommended Amount: \$58,200

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

This is a very well-written proposal that illustrates the need for the acquisition of spectrophotometers for research and educational purposes at LSU-Shreveport. The project's goals are well defined and the enhancement plan strong. The panel agrees with the applicants that fully funding this project will positively increase the overall educational quality which students receive. Full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: W. Decker Moore

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Physics & Astronomy Lab Enhancement

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

H. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  14  (of 15 points)  
 B.3  17  (of 20 points)  
 B.4   4  (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  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:**   \$63,600    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**   \$63,600  

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

This well-written proposal requests funds for several upper-division Physics lab courses and for some Astronomy lab equipment. The Physics laboratory enhancement goals and activities are very appropriate for the intended audiences. Upgrading resources related to the telescope might help to increase student interest in that exciting topic as well as encourage enrollment in affected courses. The proposal should have far-reaching impact on the general public through well-conceptualized and developed outreach activities with which LSU-Shreveport seems to have great success. The proposed activities in this area are very laudable and thus the panel recommends full funding \$63,600.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-08

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joelle S. Underwood

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Atomic Absorption Spectrometer for Upgrade of Physical  
and Analytical Chemistry Laboratories

## 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: 

80
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: \$72,388

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,388

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 from Loyola University's Chemistry faculty that is recommended for full funding of \$72,388. Although the proposal has clear goals and a well-established enhancement plan, it lacks clear description about how the atomic absorption spectrophotometer to be purchased would be shared with other faculty members, with industry, or with other interested collaborators (the outreach component).

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. Khurram S. Bhutta

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Interactive Teaching Classroom in Support of the Computer Information Systems Program at Nicholls State

## 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 8 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 

81
----

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

## 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 1 (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: \$77,646  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$77,646

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

Several Nicholls State University PIs have submitted a beautifully written proposal requesting funds to upgrade one classroom in the AACSB-accredited College of Business with 20 student computers, software, interactive LCDs, a server, and a Smartboard for CIS program instruction. The panel recommends full funding of \$77,646.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Morris Coats

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Assurance of Learning Through Computer-Assisted Instruction:  
Enhancing Learning Outcomes in the Business Foundation  
Courses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 71 (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  19   (of 20 points)  
B.4   4   (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   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.)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$20,361  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$18,211  </u>

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

Partial funding of \$18,211 is recommended for an additional 10-computer upgrade and redesign of an existing 30-laptop business lab at Nicholls, established through prior BoRSF grants, to create MyEconLab for use by approximately 600 students per year. The panel recommends funding all items except the \$2,150 for conference attendance for instruction of faculty in software. We suggest that the publisher will provide free instruction to students and faculty for effective software usage. The institutional match should be fully maintained.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael J. Gray

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Accoutrements for a Redesign Model in College Algebra

**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   8   (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  18   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  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  

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$90,624    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**   \$90,624  

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 from Nicholls State University that is particularly strong in the area of assessment of student learning outcomes in College Algebra. The methodology of redesigning and enhancing the course's format, if it is as successful as it promises to be, should serve as a superior model for other colleges and universities both statewide and regionally. Funding in full (\$90,624) is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia M. Lamberty

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Going for the Green: A Transformation of Organic Chemistry  
Laboratory

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 

78
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$29,483  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,483

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 is recommended for the funding of the requested amount (\$29,483). The proposal is clear, well structured, and has well-defined goals and strategies to accomplish the goals. One weakness, however, is that there was no clear description about how the project would affect faculty members at Nicholls other than the PI, nor about how the project would potentially impact other interested parties. A more detailed explanation in these aspects of the project would have been helpful.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenn V. Lo

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Modernization of Computer Facilities for Chemistry Instruction

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2 3 (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 3 (For NS/NE)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)  
B.2 6 (of 15 points)  
B.3 8 (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 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

56
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$38,024  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal is not recommended for funding. Identified weaknesses include poorly explained assessment procedures and the encouragement of students toward formula memorization rather than the development of critical thinking skills. Also, the impact on the quality of students is not well explained. It is unclear how this program will improve the outcomes of future students except for potentially enhancing recruitment and retention. A better discussion of the topic should have contained strategies to enhance outcomes of currently enrolled Nicholls State students.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tim Mead

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Technology Infrastructure for Reforming Teacher Education

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1   2   (of 5 points)  
 B.2   8   (of 15 points)  
 B.3   9   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   2   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1   8   (of 12 points)

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   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:**   \$89,999    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**      **Recommended Amount:**       \$0      

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

This is a very broad, sweeping proposal that several faculty claim would greatly enhance the technology capability of Nicholls State University's College of Education. However, and perhaps because it is so broad, the panel found it difficult to assess the project's goals and objectives as they are written. It is suggested that prior to implementing these goals, a detailed assessment plan for each one be developed. Funding for this project is not recommended at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038UG-08

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michele Robichaux

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Chemistry Experiences for Nursing and Allied  
Health Science Majors

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

86
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 14 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

## F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$32,135  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$32,135

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

This proposal is an excellent one from Nicholls State that deserves a recommendation for funding of the full amount requested (\$32,135). The PI delineates clear goals and defines the enhancement plan well. The panel believes that this project will serve to strengthen the Chemistry experiences of both nursing and health science majors.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039UG-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Ballard

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Play Therapy

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 18 (of 20 points)  
B.3 20 (of 25 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 4 (of 5 points)  
B.7 Yes x No \_\_\_\_\_

## E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No x

G. Total Score: 

88
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$9,218

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$9,218

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

This is a very exciting, worthy proposal from Southeastern Louisiana University that the panel believes should greatly enhance the knowledge and skills of the Counseling and Human Development program's graduates. The performance measures, as described in the proposal, should provide excellent feedback with respect to overall program effectiveness. A more proactive approach to encouraging other faculty in the unit to participate would be a useful subsidiary goal. Full funding of \$9,218 is recommended for this modest proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040UG-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Minh Q. Huynh

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Access and Availability of ThinkTank Application with Additional Licenses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   12   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   2   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$22,400  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$22,400  </u>

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

The panel recommends full funding of \$22,400 for purchase of additional ThinkTank software licenses and add-on functionality for Southeastern Louisiana University's previously funded Mobile ThinkTank (MTTS) Lab in an effort to create better use and sharing of the facility. The panel especially notes the many letters of support for the project and the generous matching funds pledged. We believe that increasing the ThinkTank lab's capacity is a worthwhile goal in order to better accommodate up to 55 students.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041UG-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rebecca W. Muller

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Learning in Introductory Math Courses

**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     8     (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    16    (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: 89 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**     \$136,905      
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**     \$136,905    

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 proposal reflects a well-conceived design coupled with a comprehensive approach to both quantitative and qualitative assessment methodologies. The goal of more active student involvement in the learning process is laudable and, the panel hopes, will prove beneficial. Full funding is recommended for this SLU project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042UG-08

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Sommerfeld

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computational Technology for Chemistry Comprehension

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

55
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)  
B.2 6 (of 15 points)  
B.3 7 (of 20 points)  
B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
B.5 1 (of 2 points)  
B.6 1 (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: \$32,000  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal from Southeastern Louisiana University is not recommended for funding. Several major weaknesses were identified by the panel, including the relatively small outreach of the project, the lack of integration between the theoretical and practical aspects of chemistry, and the enhancement plan's lack of clarity.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 043UG-08

**INSTITUTION:** Southern University and A&M College - New Orleans

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Cynthia K. Beaulieu

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Faculty and Students Entrepreneurial & Incubator Facility

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   3   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**G. Total Score:**   64   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:**   \$78,138  

**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.)

Although this proposal describes a plan to create a hands-on, entrepreneurship-related, non-traditional incubator facility at Southern University-New Orleans in an effort to aid Katrina-affected businesses, the panel does not recommend funding for this project. Several of the equipment items and most of the supply items requested are disallowed in the RFP (section V.B.6.c., entitled Disallowed Budgetary Items). In time, and if funding becomes more readily available, perhaps the laudable but broad goals of this project could be reconsidered in more realistic and measurable terms, or perhaps the PIs could seek other funding sources for the disallowed items enumerated in the proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 044UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Survey of African American Attitudes Toward African American Businesses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   8   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   1   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 35 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$59,976  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

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

This SUNO proposal requests almost \$60,000 to fund a primarily research project to investigate the contention that African-Americans are reluctant to purchase goods and services from African-American entrepreneurs doing business in metropolitan New Orleans. Although the proposed research may complement the work of students in the Business Entrepreneurship Program, the panel's consensus is that the proposal focuses almost exclusively on faculty research development and has little significant impact on the undergraduate curriculum. No funds are recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 045UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia M. Singleton

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Mathematics Curriculum at Southern University at New Orleans

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

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2     8     (of 15 points)  
 B.3    10    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     3     (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes     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           

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$190,729    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$135,000    </u>

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

This is a well-developed Southern University-New Orleans proposal that should add positively to the institution's ability to establish a functioning and effective math lab. The panel recommends reduced funding of \$135,000 to be expended for equipment, software, and shipping/handling requests. The panel further recommends that the institution maintain the equipment match in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 046UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Takona

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the College of Education Undergraduate Curriculum Through the Addition of a Course Component of Peace Education

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (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 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: \$94,980  
 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 SUNO proposal to develop two elective courses in peace education at the undergraduate level for students who teach students who are at risk in urban settings is a laudable one; probably it is one that is much needed in undergraduate teacher education nationwide. However, the lack of connection between the two proposed courses and the conflicting equipment requests (either 30 laptops and two projectors [in the budget], or 15 laptops, 5 desktops, and one projector [on p. 8 of the narrative]) precludes a recommendation for funding at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 047UG-08

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Wanga

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Parent/Child Literacy Project

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1   8   (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

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

**E. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1   1   (of 4 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   x  

**G. Total Score:**   42   (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$58,000    
**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 goal of increasing young children's literacy skills through the collaborative efforts of SUNO's College of Education faculty and students working directly with children and their parents is a laudable one. However, the proposal needs to be more narrowly focused. Perhaps separating the many goals into smaller, more manageable units that could be attempted on a pilot basis would be helpful. The panel does not recommend funding for this project at this time.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 048UG-08

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cheryl L. Stevens

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Undergraduate Experience Through  
Crystallography Education and the Purchase of a New X-ray  
Diffractometer

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1   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   2   (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 54 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1   2   (of 4 points)

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   x   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:   \$306,900    
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 could not recommend this proposal for funding as it stands. Several major weaknesses were identified in a proposal that requests Support Funds of over \$300,000. Since only one PI from Xavier University signed the cover page and since the proposed work of other potential users is touted, the panel wondered why these researchers were not included as Co-PIs. How will the new X-ray diffractometer be shared among researchers, since the PI asserts that the instrument will be used primarily for research? Equally vague is the discussion of how the integration between research and pedagogy will be accomplished, since the section relating to impact on curriculum and instruction is not well explained. In addition, the assessment procedures are poorly described. The panel suggests that the PI improve the proposal for possible resubmission in another cycle by addressing each of the weaknesses listed above.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 049UG-08

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donna Stutson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer Based Mathematics Teaching Labs

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$88,628    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**   \$88,628  

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

The goal of increasing the developmental mathematics course retention rate of Xavier University freshmen by updating equipment and software in the math teaching labs and classrooms is very worthwhile. This well-written proposal could have been further improved, however, if it had more specific approaches to achieving all of the goals. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding of \$88,628 for the project.

# Appendix A

## Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the  
Undergraduate Enhancement Program  
for the FY 2007-2008 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-08 MAT</b>	Computers for Enhancing Instruction in Development Mathematics	Bossier Parish Community College (Mathematics and Technical Education);	Donna Densmore; Frank Viviano;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 7,394</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 7,394</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>002UG-08 MAT</b>	Using Technology and Manipulatives to Improve the Preparation of Future Elementary Teachers	Bossier Parish Community College (Mathematics and Technical Education);	Donna Densmore; Frank Viviano;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 60,951</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 60,951</b>

**N**

Proposal is a **New Request**

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-08 BUS</b>	Technology = Success for Business Students	Bossier Parish Community College (Business and Computer Science);	Pam Milstead;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 29,438</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 29,438</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>004UG-08 MAT</b>	Transformation of Developmental Math: Student Success and Engagement	Bossier Parish Community College (Academic Affairs);	Barbara Poole;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b>	<b>\$ 48,903</b> <b>\$ 8,439</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 57,342</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>005UG-08 CHE</b>	Computer-aided Peer Instruction and Real-time Evaluation of Student Learning in Chemistry and Physics Classes	Centenary College (Chemistry);	Joshua D. Lawrence; Ernest W. Blakeney; Juan Rodriguez; Mary R. Garrett; Thomas M. Ticich;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 16,361</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,361</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-08 PHY</b>	Enhancing Physics Education with Research Experiences Throughout the Curriculum	Centenary College (Physics);	Juan Rodriguez;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 15,500</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,500</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>007UG-08 BUS</b>	Computer Classroom Management System	Delgado Community College (Business and Technology);	Rene' Cintron; Dennis Worsham;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 38,569</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 38,569</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>008UG-08 BUS</b>	Delgado Accounting Computer Lab	Delgado Community College (Business and Technology);	Marilyn G. Ciolina; Kim W. Gatzke;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 104,258</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 104,258</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-08 PHY</b>	Enhancement of Instruction Pre-Engineering	Dillard University (Natural Sciences and Public Health);	Ruby Broadway; Abdalla Darwish;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 99,071</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 99,071</b>

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>010UG-08 BUS</b>	Establishing an Institute for Academic Achievement (IA2)	Dillard University (Marketing/MIS);	Janice Burrell-Pinera; Christian V. Fugar; Kemberley A. Washington; Mohammed E. Hussain; Richard P. Baucum;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 92,064</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 92,064</b>

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>011UG-08 CHE</b>	Enhancing the Instrumental Analysis Laboratory for Instruction and Research	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Sonya L. Caston; Benard Singleton; Lovell Agwaramgbo; Ruby Broadway;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 47,562</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 47,562</b>

E

Proposal is a **New 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>012UG-08 BUS</b>	ABLE Business Center	Dillard University (Business);	Kim M. Coleman; Alain Durocher; Mohammed Hussain; Nazar Mustapha;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 93,626</b>  <b>\$ 93,626</b>
<b>E</b> Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>013UG-08 BUS</b>	ABLE Conference	Dillard University (Business);	Kim M. Coleman; Alain Durocher; Mohammed Hussain; Nazar Mustapha;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 73,511</b>  <b>\$ 73,511</b>
<b>N</b> Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>014UG-08 BUS</b>	ABLE Training Program	Dillard University (Business);	Kim M. Coleman; Alain Durocher; Mohammed Hussain; Nazar Mustapha;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,441</b>  <b>\$ 49,441</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-08 MAT</b>	Enhancement of Undergraduate Acturial Sciences Phase-III (UAS-III)	Dillard University (Mathematics);	Hong Dai; Christian Fugar; Peter Frempong-Mireku;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 95,341</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 95,341</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**

Previous Contract: 2002-03-ENH-UG-16; 04-05-ENH-UG-06

<b>016UG-08 MAT</b>	Enhancement of Pre-Mathematics Initiatives II (EPMI-II)	Dillard University (Mathematics);	Peter Frempong-Mireku; Haewon Lee; Hong Dai; Valerie L. Epps;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 65,700</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 65,700</b>

**N**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>017UG-08 BUS</b>	Enhancing International Business and World Languages Education	Dillard University (Business);	Christian V. Fugar; Aurea Diab; Hong Dai; Nazar S. Mustapha;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 140,440</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 140,440</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New 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>018UG-08 MAT</b>	Enhancing Digital Cultures Across the Curriculum	Dillard University (Mathematics/Computer Science);	Gloria C. Love; Azubike D. Okpalaeze; John Wilson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 54,928</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 54,928</b>

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>019UG-08 MAT</b>	Mathematics Instruction: Enhanced Across the Curriculum	Dillard University (Mathematics/Computer Science);	Gloria C. Love; Azubike D. Okpalaeze; John Wilson; Valerie L. Epps;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 81,345</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 81,345</b>

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>020UG-08 CHE</b>	Instructional Enhancement for General Chemistry Laboratory (IEGCL)	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Pamela Mitchell; Lovell Agwaramgbo; Sonya L. Caston;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 74,452</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 74,452</b>

E

Proposal is a **New 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>021UG-08 BUS</b>	Small Business and Accounting Center in the Division of Business	Dillard University (Business);	Kemberley A. Washington; Christian Fugar; Janice Burrell-Pinera; Richard Baucum;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 79,341</b>  <b>\$ 79,341</b>
N Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>022UG-08 CHE</b>	Acquisition of Accessory Equipment to Enhance Grambling State University Chemistry Labs	Grambling State University (Chemistry);	Pia R. Albuquerque; Bobby Burkes; Frank Y. Ohene; Tony L. Perry;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 98,020</b>  <b>\$ 98,020</b>
E Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>023UG-08 CHE</b>	Analytical Balances for Upper Level Chemistry Courses	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria (Mathematics and Physical Sciences);	John R. Allen;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,380</b>  <b>\$ 15,380</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>024UG-08 MAT</b>	Mobile Computer Center Acquisition	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria (Mathematics and Physical Sciences);	Tommy Awtry;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 97,470</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 97,470</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>025UG-08 EDU</b>	Enhancement of Assessment Success and Educational Improvement with Technology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria (Education);	Sherry P. Bovey; Teresa Seymour;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 134,280</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 134,280</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>026UG-08 CHE</b>	Acquisition of Epsilon Electrochemical Analyzer for Chemistry Curriculum	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria (Mathematics and Physical Sciences);	Gezahegn T. Chaka;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 22,508</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 22,508</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-08 EDU</b>	Math, Science, Technology, Check It Out!	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Education);	Jerry Antee; Julie Bergeron;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 49,446</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,446</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>028UG-08 EDU</b>	Music Education Resource Upgrade to Serve Pre-Service Teachers	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Music Education Program);	LaWanda Blakeney; D. Cay Evans;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 15,300</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 15,300</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>029UG-08 CHE</b>	Enhancement of Spectrophotometry in Biochemistry Laboratory	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Chemistry and Physics);	Elahe Mahdavian; M. Cran Lucas; Richard Thompson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 58,200</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 58,200</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-08 PHY</b>	Undergraduate Physics & Astronomy Lab Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Physics & Astronomy Program);	W. Decker Moore; Gary R. Boucher;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 63,600</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 63,600</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>031UG-08 CHE</b>	Atomic Absorption Spectrometer for Upgrade of Physical and Analytical Chemistry Laboratories	Loyola University New Orleans (Chemistry);	Joelle S. Underwood;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 72,388</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,388</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>032UG-08 BUS</b>	Interactive Teaching Classroom in Support of the Computer Information Systems Program at Nicholls State	Nicholls State University (Business Administration);	M. Khurram S. Bhutta; Betty Kleen; En Mao; Kit Williams; Michael Chiasson; Randy Ryker; Ronnie Fanguy;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 77,646</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 77,646</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-08 BUS E</b>	Assurance of Learning Through Computer-Assisted Instruction: Enhancing Learning Outcomes in the Business Foundation Courses	Nicholls State University (Business Administration);	R. Morris Coats; Betty Kleen; Chad Turner; Kevin Cruthirds; R. Charles Viosca, Jr.; Shari Lawrence; Sherry Rodrigue; Sonya Premeaux;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 20,361</b>  <b>\$ 20,361</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>034UG-08 MAT E</b>	Accoutrements for a Redesign Model in College Algebra	Nicholls State University (Mathematics and Computer Science);	Michael J. Gray; Ianna H. West; Scott J. Beslin; Sherill Lind Dupree;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 90,624</b>  <b>\$ 90,624</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>035UG-08 CHE N</b>	Going for the Green: A Transformation of Organic Chemistry Laboratory	Nicholls State University (Physical Sciences);	Cynthia M. Lamberty;	<b>1</b>  <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 29,483</b>  <b>\$ 29,483</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-08 CHE</b>	Modernization of Computer Facilities for Chemistry Instruction	Nicholls State University (Physical Sciences);	Glenn V. Lo; April A. Dupre;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 38,024</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 38,024</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>037UG-08 EDU</b>	Technology Infrastructure for Reforming Teacher Education	Nicholls State University (Education);	Tim Mead; Andy Simoncelli; Gary Rosenthal; Steven Welsh; Sumita Bhattacharyya;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 89,999</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 89,999</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>038UG-08 CHE</b>	Enhancing Chemistry Experiences for Nursing and Allied Health Science Majors	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Michele Robichaux; Angela Corbin; Duane Smith, Jr.; Lois Nelson; Rajkumar Nathaniel;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 32,135</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 32,135</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New 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>039UG-08 EDU</b>	Enhancing Play Therapy	Southeastern Louisiana University (Counseling & Human Development);	Mary Ballard; Barbara Hebert;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 9,218</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,218</b>

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>040UG-08 BUS</b>	Enhancing the Access and Availability of ThinkTank Application with Additional Licenses	Southeastern Louisiana University (Management);	Minh Q. Huynh; Barbara A. Schuldt;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 22,400</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 22,400</b>

N

Proposal is a **Continuation Request**

Previous Contract: LEQSF(2006-07)-ENH-UG-38

<b>041UG-08 MAT</b>	Enhancing Learning in Introductory Math Courses	Southeastern Louisiana University (Mathematics);	Rebecca W. Muller; Timothy Hudson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 136,905</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 136,905</b>

E

Proposal is a **New 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>042UG-08 CHE</b>	Computational Technology for Chemistry Comprehension	Southeastern Louisiana University (Chemistry and Physics);	Thomas Sommerfeld; William Parkinson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 32,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 32,000</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>043UG-08 BUS</b>	Faculty and Students Entrepreneurial & Incubator Facility	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Business and Public Administration);	Cynthia K. Beaulieu; Frank Martin; Igew Udeh; Louis C. Mancuso; Simeon O. Okpechi;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 78,138</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 78,138</b>

**N**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>044UG-08 BUS</b>	Survey of African American Attitudes Toward African American Businesses	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Business Entrepreneurship);	Frank Martin; Vera Autry;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 59,976</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 59,976</b>

**N**

Proposal is a **New 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>045UG-08 MAT</b>	Enhancing the Mathematics Curriculum at Southern University at New Orleans	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Natural Sciences);	Cynthia M. Singleton; Zheng Chen;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 190,729</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 190,729</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>046UG-08 EDU</b>	Enhancement of the College of Education Undergraduate Curriculum Through the Addition of a Course Component of Peace Education	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Education);	James Takona; Sudipta Das;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 94,980</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 94,980</b>

**E**

Proposal is a **New Request**

<b>047UG-08 EDU</b>	Parent/Child Literacy Project	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Education);	Pamela Wanga;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 58,000</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 58,000</b>

**N**

Proposal is a **New 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>048UG-08 CHE</b>	Enhancing the Undergraduate Experience Through Crystallography Education and the Purchase of a New X-ray Diffractometer	Xavier University (Chemistry);	Cheryl L. Stevens;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 306,900</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 306,900</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>049UG-08 MAT</b>	Computer Based Mathematics Teaching Labs	Xavier University (Mathematics);	Donna Stutson; Gurdial Arora; Vljako Kocic;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 88,628</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 88,628</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program for the FY 2007-2008 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>49</b>	<b>\$3,450,934</b>	<b>\$3,459,373</b>	<b>\$1,620,000</b>

# Appendix B

## Rating Forms

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

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

No Points Given,  
But this is a required  
component

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

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 12 pts

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

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

\_\_\_\_\_ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_ NO\_\_

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

COMMENTS:

=====

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

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

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