

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

February 18, 2011

Prepared by:

Laurie McNeil (Chair)
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Stephen R. Addison
University of Central Arkansas

ENHANCEMENT REVIEW REPORT

PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY

FY 2010-11

Introduction

The Physics and Astronomy Review Panel consisting of Dr. Laurie McNeil, Professor of Physics and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; and Dr. Stephen Addison, Professor of Physics and Chair of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Central Arkansas, met February 18, 2011 in Baton Rouge to evaluate eighteen (18) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the meeting: (1) all proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, PIs, their institutions, and funds requested; (3) a copy of the most recent Physics and Astronomy panel report (FY 2007-08); and (4) the FY 2010-11 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel reviewed and evaluated them. During the review each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria detailed in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of funding.

The eighteen (18) Physics and Astronomy proposals submitted in FY 2010-11 requested a total of \$1,994,555 in first-year funds. Five (5) proposals were highly recommended for funding, two (2) of those at reduced levels.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding, together with the recommended funding levels. The panel recommends full funding for the partially funded proposals in Table I in rank order if additional monies become available. Table II contains a list of proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available once recommendations for Table I have been satisfied. Table III contains a list of proposals 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 this report.

**Traditional Enhancement Physics/Astronomy Table I
Highly Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	97	18PHY-11	UNO	\$84,466	\$84,466		
2	96	03PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$88,000	\$80,000		
3	95.5	10PHY-11	LaTech	\$62,943	\$62,943		
4	95	05PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$200,480	\$200,480		
5	94	13PHY-11	Tulane	\$167,092	\$161,322		
Totals				\$602,981	\$589,211		

**Traditional Enhancement Physics/Astronomy Table II
Recommended for Funding if Additional Funding Becomes Available**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
6	92	17PHY-11	UNO	\$127,026	\$127,026		
7	88	14PHY-11	UL-L	\$132,200	\$132,200		
Totals				\$259,226	\$259,226		

**Traditional Enhancement Physics/Astronomy Table III
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
8	83	07PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$265,680	\$0		
9	82	12PHY-11	SU-BR	\$155,000	\$0		
9	82	15PHY-11	UL-L	\$55,905	\$0		
11	67	06PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$151,590	\$0		
12	65	08PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$48,887	\$0		
13	64	01PHY-11	Dillard	\$106,252	\$0		
14	62	04PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$103,100	\$0		
15	61	09PHY-11	LSU-BR	\$98,286	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	57	11PHY-11	SU-BR	\$67,209	\$0		
17	54	02PHY-11	LSU-A	\$58,495	\$0	\$58,495	\$0
17	54	16PHY-11	ULM	\$21,944	\$0		
Totals				\$1,132,348	\$0	\$58,495	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01PHY-11

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Instruction and the Laboratory Experience in the
Physics Department at Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Abdalla Darwish

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 6 (of 18 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 8 (of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$106,252
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 goals are admirable; however, planning for the courses is not sufficiently described. There is no evidence of what new teaching methodologies will be used or why the equipment is needed to use them. A faculty member with electronics expertise might have made more judicious choices of equipment in order to make maximum use of available funds and avoid duplication of functions. It is also not clear how replacing old equipment from other labs affects the goals of this proposal. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Physics Content Knowledge and Method of Physics Teaching of High School Physics Teachers in Central Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. Sultan Parvez

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 4 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 23 points)
B.3 10 (of 25 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 54 (of 100 points)

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

	Requested	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Amount:	\$58,495	\$58,495*
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

The goal of improving the content knowledge of in-service physics teachers is admirable. However, by law Board of Regents Support Fund monies may only be expended for higher education purposes and, therefore, cannot be used to fund stipends for K-12 teachers or equipment for K-12 schools. Refreshments are also not allowable expenses according to the RFP. The proposal would have been problematic even if it conformed to the regulations. A research-validated pedagogical system should be adopted that addresses both content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. A fundable project would include assessment of both the teachers and their students. No funding is recommended.

*The RFP stipulates that no more than \$50,000 can be requested in year two of a proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading of First Year Physics Courses for Engineers-Learning Assistants and Peer Instruction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raymond Chastain

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 21 (of 23 points)
 B.3 23 (of 25 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 6 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$88,000
 Recommended Amount: \$80,000

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

The proposal request funds to restructure introductory physics courses based on a model successfully developed nationally by the University of Colorado and the University of Washington that incorporates peer teaching and tutorial sessions. The review panel strongly supports the project model. However, we recommend that only 20 of the 22 stipends for learning assistants be funded in this initial offering of the program. More details about the training program would have been useful. Though details of the model are readily accessible, the review panel should not be required to perform outside research. It is not clear to the panel why a tenure-track faculty appointment is needed. A fixed-term appointment (without obligation to produce research) might be more suitable. Partial funding is recommended with the institutional match to be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU Nuclear Workforce Development Program – Equipment for
New Faculty Laboratories

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Cherry

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 3 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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: \$103,100
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

Because the request is for start-up funds for a faculty member who has not yet been hired, it is difficult to evaluate the suitability of the equipment proposed for purchase. The panel cannot make an award without knowing who the faculty member is who would benefit from the award. It is impossible to evaluate the impact of the purchase on the eminence of the department and the impact of the apparatus on faculty development. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Quantum Design Magnetic Property
Measurement System for Condensed Matter Physics and
Materials Science Investigations

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John DiTusa

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No _____
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 18 points)
B.3 20 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$200,480
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$200,480

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 need to replace the current instrument is clearly described in the proposal. It is a workhorse that has reached the end of its useful life. Replacing it with the requested equipment will allow the research activities of faculty from multiple departments to continue at their current level, and will allow them to complete funded research projects now underway. More could have been said about what research the new capabilities of the more modern instrument would make possible. It should also be possible to incorporate the instrument into classroom instruction as well as research, even in the absence of the proposed new MS&E curriculum. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Photoelectron System for Materials Science Investigations at
CAMD

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Orhan Kizilkaya

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 0 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 0 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$151,590
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.)

Rather than providing actual project goals and measurable objectives, the proposal instead listed research projects that would benefit from the requested equipment. Closer attention to the requirements listed in the RFP would have improved the proposal. The impact of the acquisition of the requested equipment on faculty development is not given, only the impact on the research projects. The proposal suffered from poor grammar and language usage. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Nanophase Materials Characterization System at
3m NIM Beamline at CAMD

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yaroslav Losovyj

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$265,680
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 research that this instrument would support is worthwhile. The work plan gives examples of experiments rather than describing how the instrument is to be obtained and commissioned. Better editing of the prose would have significantly improved the proposal. Although this is a quality proposal, it is not as competitive as others for which funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Nanomaterial Preparation and Deposition System for
Multidisciplinary Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Philip Sprunger

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 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 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$48,887
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 the research described is worthy, the proposal is insufficiently detailed and therefore does not allow for a complete evaluation. The rationale emphasizes the need for a variety of deposition sources, but some of the projects appear to be in greater need of a substrate heater, which is not included in the plan. The need for UHV is poorly supported in the project descriptions, and the grouping of all of these projects under the "fast-moving train" of nanoscience is dubious. The work plan doesn't describe how the work will be done or exactly what the work is. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Motorized Slit Assembly for the Enhancement of an X-ray
Magnetic Circular Dichroism Beamline at CAMD

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shane Stadler

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 61 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$98,286</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The justification for the upgrade is not adequately explained. What experiments could be done that cannot be done without it? What is their significance? What experiments of this type have been done at other facilities? Who besides the PI would use it, and for what purpose? Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10PHY-11

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Upper Level Physics Laboratories at
Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Shaw

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 16 (of 18 points)
 B.3 18.5 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 6 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 95.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$62,943</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$62,943</u>

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

This is a well-designed set of experiments that is very appropriate for the institution. The equipment request is modest (possibly even too much so). It would have been useful to have specific learning outcomes and an assessment plan to evaluate whether or not they are being met. This investment will help to bring the department up to the level of its peer institutions. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Physics Teaching and Learning Enhancement (PTLE)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Terrence Reese

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 8 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 4 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,209
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 digital projectors would clearly be useful, though not all the requested accessories are needed. The videoconferencing equipment is less well justified. Are there a number of faculty who would be interested in giving seminars by videoconference, and would the seminars really improve instruction in the department? More expertise in the use of such equipment might have led to a somewhat different request, perhaps including a document camera. If there are distance education classrooms on campus, the faculty members should become familiar with them to identify the most important capabilities that need to be available for effective instruction. The request for student desks to be used with clickers is not only inappropriate but also would not lead to effective instruction; mobility is important in the use of personal response systems. The panel suggests that faculty members better acquaint themselves with the use of these pedagogical aids, perhaps by attending workshops on their uses or by contacting vendors for demonstrations of the use of such devices. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12PHY-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate Education in Astronomy and Astrophysics at Southern University: A Multi-Use Planetarium System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Stacy

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$155,000
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 project is, in general, a good idea. However, it seems like a prime target for private donation. It might be better to seek a larger amount of money for a new facility rather than putting this equipment in the existing 20-foot dome. The plan for multiple use of the facility is problematic due to the delicate nature of the equipment. Movable seating is not a good idea if small children will be attending shows, due to safety issues. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13PHY-11

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Ion Milling System to Enhance Research and Education in
Material Science and Engineering at Tulane

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mao Zhiqiang

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$167,092
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$161,322

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 science and the people involved are good. The work plan does not actually describe how the project (acquisition and commissioning of the ion mill) will be carried out. The directions in the RFP should have been followed more closely. The difference between the requested and recommended funds could be made up with an increased institutional match, if a price reduction cannot be negotiated with the manufacturer. Partial funding is recommended with the institutional match maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14PHY-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Resolution Upgrades to Ion Accelerator and High Energy Focused Ion Beam Systems for Research and Education in Science and Engineering

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Glass

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$132,200
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$132,200

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is a worthy proposal that should be funded if sufficient monies become available. The research is not quite as cutting-edge as that described in some other proposals in the competition, but is certainly worthwhile. If funds do become available but are insufficient to fund this proposal fully, the cost of installation of the high-stability voltage control system (\$18,000) could be borne by the institution.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15PHY-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Analysis of Rock Microstructure Using High Resolution STM
Microtomography

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Louis Houston

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**E. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**
(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$55,905
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 experiments that form the heart of the proposal are of interest, but it is not clear that the proposed equipment is the best way to accomplish the scientific goals. The proposal describes experiments from various faculty for which the equipment would be made available for that appear to be a much more appropriate use of the equipment. Such research would have been a much more suitable justification for acquiring the instrument. It is not clear how the acquisition of this apparatus would enhance the department. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16PHY-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: System Enhancements to a Photoreaction Vacuum Chamber

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Anderson

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	<u> </u>
A.2		<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>1</u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>1</u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>1</u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1	<u>0</u>	(of 2 points)
E.2a	<u>8</u>	(For S/E)
or		(of 10 points)
E.2b	<u> </u>	(For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1	<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)
B.2	<u>12</u>	(of 18 points)
B.3	<u>7</u>	(of 20 points)
B.4	<u>4</u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)
B.6	<u>0</u>	(of 6 points)
B.7	Yes <u> </u>	No <u> </u> X <u> </u>

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u>4</u>	(of 12 points)
-----	----------	----------------

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes <u>X</u>	No <u> </u>
-----	--------------	----------------------

G. Total Score: 54 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$21,944</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal is poorly prepared and missing a number of required sections. The applicant should have paid closer attention to requirements described in the RFP. The proposal does not make a convincing case that the apparatus would function as desired with the additional components. It appears unlikely that this proposal will lead (even indirectly) to the establishment of a physics degree program at the institution at a time when physics programs are being cut elsewhere in the State. The PI would likely benefit from seeking a collaborator with more expertise in vacuum system technology and other aspects of the proposed experiments. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17PHY-11

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Optical Profiler for 3-Dimensional
Characterization of Complex Stimuli-Responsive Microstructures

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leszek Malkinski

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 16 (of 18 points)
 B.3 19 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 6 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$127,026

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$127,026

(if additional funds become available)

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

The panel recommends that this proposal be fully funded if additional monies become available. If full funding is not possible, the budget could be trimmed by \$15,000 by removing the 20x and 50x objectives. The equipment would be very useful in both research and teaching. The work plan is well done, and the research that the instrument would support is worthwhile.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018PHY-11

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Hall Effect/Nernst Effect Low Temperature Measurement System
for Research and Education in Electronic Materials

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kevin Stokes

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 97 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$84,466</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$84,466</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 acquisition of this instrument would certainly advance the capabilities of the department. The educational uses are also worthy. The objectives are measurable. The work plan is well done and complete. The requested amount is modest for this type of equipment. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Physics/Astronomy
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001PHY-11	Darwish, Abdalla	Dillard University	1	E	N	Enhancing the instruction and the laboratory experience in the physics department at Dillard University	\$106,252.00	\$0.00	\$106,252.00
002PHY-11	Parvez, M. Sultan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	2	NE	N	Enhancing the Physics Content Knowledge and Method of Physics Teaching of High School Physics Teachers in Central Louisiana	\$58,495.00	\$58,495.00*	\$116,990.00
003PHY-11	Chastain, Raymond	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	NE	N	Upgrading of First year Physics Courses for Engineers -- Learning Assistants and Peer Instruction	\$88,000.00	\$0.00	\$88,000.00
004PHY-11	Cherry, Michael	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	LSU Nuclear Workforce Development Program - Equipment for New Faculty Laboratories	\$103,100.00	\$0.00	\$103,100.00
005PHY-11	DiTusa, John	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Acquisition of a Quantum Design Magnetic Property Measurement System for Condensed Matter Physics and Materials Science Investigations	\$200,480.00	\$0.00	\$200,480.00
006PHY-11	Kizilkaya, Orhan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	A photoelectron system for materials science investigations at CAMD	\$151,590.00	\$0.00	\$151,590.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
007PHY-11	Losovyj, Yaroslav	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Enhancement of Nanophase Materials Characterization System at 3m NIM Beamline at CAMD	\$265,680.00	\$0.00	\$265,680.00
008PHY-11	Sprunger, Philip	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Nanomaterial preparation and deposition system for multidisciplinary research and education	\$48,887.00	\$0.00	\$48,887.00
009PHY-11	Stadler, Shane	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	2	E	N	A Motorized Slit Assembly for the Enhancement of an X-ray Magnetic Circular Dichroism Beamline at CAMD	\$98,286.00	\$0.00	\$98,286.00
010PHY-11	Shaw, John	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Enhancement of the Upper Level Physics Laboratories at Louisiana Tech University	\$62,943.00	\$0.00	\$62,943.00
011PHY-11	Reese, Terrence	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Physics Teaching and Learning Enhancement (PTLE)	\$67,209.00	\$0.00	\$67,209.00
012PHY-11	Stacy, John	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Enhancement of Undergraduate Education in Astronomy and Astrophysics at Southern University: A Multi-Use Planetarium System	\$155,000.00	\$0.00	\$155,000.00
013PHY-11	Mao, Zhiqiang	Tulane University	1	E	N	An ion milling system to enhance research and education in material science and engineering at Tulane	\$167,092.00	\$0.00	\$167,092.00
014PHY-11	Glass, Gary	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	High resolution upgrades to ion accelerator and high energy focused ion beam systems for research and education in science and engineering	\$132,200.00	\$0.00	\$132,200.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
015PHY-11	Houston,Louis	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Analysis of Rock Microstructure Using High Resolution STIM Microtomography	\$55,905.00	\$0.00	\$55,905.00
016PHY-11	Anderson,John	University of Louisiana at Monroe	1	E	N	System Enhancements to a Photoreaction Vacuum Chamber.	\$21,944.00	\$0.00	\$21,944.00
017PHY-11	Malkinski,Leszek	University of New Orleans	1	E	N	Acquisition of Optical Profiler for 3-Dimensional Characterization of Complex Stimuli-Responsive Microstructures	\$127,026.00	\$0.00	\$127,026.00
018PHY-11	Stokes,Kevin	University of New Orleans	1	E	N	Hall Effect/Nernst Effect Low Temperature Measurement System for Research and Education in Electronic Materials	\$84,466.00	\$0.00	\$84,466.00

* The Enhancement Program RFP restricts requests for 2nd-year funding to no more than \$50,000

Total Number of Proposals submitted	18
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,994,555.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$58,495.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,053,050.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

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 56 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 18 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 6 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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. 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:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 66 points

- _____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?
- _____ of 23 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 6 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?

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?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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. 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:

F. 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: _____