

FY 2010-11 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); Dr. Alexandru Biris, University of Arkansas Little Rock; and Dr. Sonya Stephens, Florida A&M University, met February 17-19, 2011, in Baton Rouge to evaluate 43 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 was directed to the following materials prior to the visit: a) 43 Undergraduate proposals to be evaluated with appropriate rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, and dollars requested; c) the FY 2010-11 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2008 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 the 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 \$3,560,982. The total amount of Support Funds allocated to the proposals that are recommended for first-year funding is \$1,605,727. 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.

The panel recommended sixteen (16) proposals for full funding and nine (9) proposals 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 eighteen (18) proposals did not score 70 or greater and were not recommended for funding.

Four of the five members of this panel have reviewed Undergraduate Enhancement proposals in the last decade. Over that time we have noticed a significant increase in the quality of proposals submitted. However, this year 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 for these we advised applicants to revise their proposals and resubmit them in another cycle. The review panel thought most highly of proposals that seemed to hold the promise of having the largest impact on the greatest number of students, and that could enunciate how that impact would be assessed. Proposals that focused on funding specialized research projects involving small numbers of faculty, having little evidence of student involvement, and especially requesting summer salary, were evaluated in a less positive light.

This is the first cycle in which three proposals were ineligible to receive any Undergraduate Enhancement funding. In each case the institution that submitted the proposal is ineligible to compete in Undergraduate Enhancement since it offers two or more doctoral degree programs.

TABLE I
2011 UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	97	018UG-11	NORTHWESTERN	\$90,821	\$90,821		
2	95	002UG-11	CENTENARY	\$93,406	\$93,406		
3	94	020UG-11	NORTHWESTERN	\$130,761	\$125,361		
4	93	009UG-11	LSU-A	\$104,081	\$104,081		
5	92	028UG-11	SU-NO	\$136,972	\$101,472		
6	91	013UG-11	LOYOLA	\$79,156	\$46,374		
7	90	022UG-11	SLU	\$47,529	\$47,529		
8	89	012UG-11	LSU-S	\$34,848	\$34,848		
9	88	016UG-11	NICHOLLS	\$40,115	\$40,115		
10	87	005UG-11	DILLARD	\$30,000	\$30,000		
11	86	007UG-11	GRAMBLING	\$123,500	\$121,000		
12	85	017UG-11	NICHOLLS	\$72,640	\$72,640		
13	83	023UG-11	SLU	\$31,769	\$31,769		
14	81	014UG-11	LOYOLA	\$45,064	\$45,064		
15	80	037UG-11	SU-NO	\$105,299	\$89,499	\$0	\$0
16	79	011UG-11	LSU-S	\$13,583	\$13,583		
17	78	001UG-11	CENTENARY	\$50,408	\$50,408		
18	77	015UG-11	LOYOLA	\$19,046	\$19,046		
19	76	006UG-11	DILLARD	\$67,000	\$67,000		
20	75	042UG-11	XAVIER	\$118,127	\$118,127		
21	74	026UG-11	SU-NO	\$39,820	\$27,300		
22	73	043UG-11	XAVIER	\$93,700	\$46,200		
23	72	021UG-11	ST. JOSEPH SEM	\$20,606	\$20,606		
24	71	004UG-11	DELGADO	\$266,770	\$137,000		
25	70	041UG-11	XAVIER	\$91,987	\$32,478	\$49,810	\$0
TOTALS:				\$1,947,008	\$1,605,727	\$49,810	\$0

TABLE II
2011 UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
26	67	003UG-11	DELGADO	\$105,582	\$0		
27	66	033UG-11	SU-NO	\$172,789	\$0		
28	65	019UG-11	NORTHWESTERN	\$75,640	\$0		
29	64	030UG-11	SU-NO	\$62,092	\$0	\$45,912	\$0
30	62	034UG-11	SU-NO	\$104,911	\$0	\$50,000	\$0
31	60	032UG-11	SU-NO	\$88,807	\$0		
32	59	031UG-11	SU-NO	\$67,533	\$0	\$32,533	\$0
33	57	036UG-11	SU-NO	\$151,935	\$0		
34	56	029UG-11	SU-NO	\$66,325	\$0		
35	52	010UG-11	LSU-A	\$77,219	\$0		
36	50	027UG-11	SU-NO	\$150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
37	43	025UG-11	SU-NO	\$39,032	\$0		
38	39	008UG-11	LSU-A	\$78,000	\$0		
39	30	038UG-11	SU-NO	\$33,750	\$0		
40	28	035UG-11	SU-NO	\$143,785	\$0		
		024UG-11	SU-BR	\$85,567	\$0		
		039UG-11	ULL	\$48,220	\$0		
		040UG-11	ULM	\$62,787	\$0		
			TOTALS:	\$1,613,974	\$0	\$128,445	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001UG-11

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Brownholland

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mainstreaming Air-Free Synthetic Techniques in Undergraduate Laboratories

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 6 (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 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 9 (of 12 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: \$50,408
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$50,408

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 describes interesting research in organic chemistry. The research projects proposed are of high novelty and quality with a potentially strong impact. The faculty's expertise is good. However, the Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact on the Curricula sections could have been improved. The description of the housing of the instrumentations was incomplete, and the applicant could have been clearer in describing how this proposal would enhance the level of collaboration between students and faculty members from various departments and colleges. Despite these minor concerns, the panel recommends full funding of \$50,408.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002UG-11

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Helen Sikes

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Student Learning Through Service: One Tax Return at a Time
An Enhancement of the Centenary College Accounting
Program & the Frost School of Business Volunteer Tax
Assistance Program

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 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)

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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)

F.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$93,406
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$93,406

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.)

Equipment and software are requested to create a permanent center for a successful tax-preparation pilot program at Centenary College. This program is currently relegated to shared classrooms, older hardware and use of the PI's outdated tax-preparation software. In spite of limitations, the program has provided hands-on tax preparation services for 14 accounting students serving 58 taxpayers during the 2008 and 2009 filing seasons. Having proven its value to Centenary College's accounting students and the community of Shreveport-Bossier City, the third largest population center in Louisiana with 310,000 residents, full funding is recommended to establish a permanent site for placement of new hardware and software.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003UG-11

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Raymond Duplessis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Chemistry/Biochemistry Lab Tech 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 5 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 1 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 18 points)
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)
 B.4 2 (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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

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: \$105,582
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 requests the enhancement of a chemistry/biochemistry laboratory at Delgado Community College. Although the need for such a laboratory probably is high, the proposal failed to fully explain the impact that the laboratory would have on students and faculty development. Moreover, there are almost no details regarding how this lab will enhance the department's potential to achieve recognized eminence at regional, national, or international levels. The section describing the impact of this project on industrial partners is underdeveloped. Although the panel is convinced that the need for the enhancement of the lab is real, the proposal failed to provide measurable implementation steps, credible assessment of development of the project and an explanation of the impact on students and faculty development. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004UG-11

INSTITUTION: Delgado Community College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dena Frickey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Developmental Math Redesign

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 18 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$266,770
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$137,000

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 applicant's discussion of the various types of lectures (traditional, online, hybrid, and flex) was very interesting. The use of MyMathLab for traditional sections is a nice addition to try to increase student participation, but it will be interesting to see if grades actually improve given the rationale for the lower grades in traditional sections (students do not do homework but simply come to class for the lectures). While the proposed project is a good one, the panel recommends reducing the requested budget by almost half, with the PI determining where best to reduce expenses. However, the institutional match should be maintained since it covers personnel teaching courses and training sessions for 88 faculty members. This expansive project is recommended for partial funding of \$137,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005UG-11

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonya Caston

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Analytical Chemistry and Instrumental
Analysis Lecture and Laboratory Experience

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$30,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$30,000

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 panel expects that this project will have a significant impact on both Chemistry Department education and research at Dillard University. The work and implementation plans are well developed. The proposed program is well described and structured to have a direct impact on the the education of students and their student outcomes. The panel recommends the project for full funding of \$30,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006UG-11

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hong Dai

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

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 1 (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 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (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)

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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$67,000

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

This is a project to increase the number of actuarial sciences majors. The panel noted that the recruitment presentation at high schools is a handy tool. The proposal could have been strengthened by involving other faculty in addition to the PI to ensure its sustainability. The proposal would also have been improved if there had been efforts to establish stronger relationships between Dillard University and the State agencies mentioned. Nevertheless, this project is recommended for full funding of \$67,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007UG-11

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Ohene

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of High Performance Liquid Chromatography and Capillary Electrophoresis for the Integration of Hands-on Separation Techniques into the 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 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 8 (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 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

86

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$123,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$121,000

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.)

Although this proposal, as written, was generally good, the budget justification did not quite add up correctly. Reviewers noted two different requested amounts: \$123,500 and \$123,100. The need for the proposed instruments was clearly described, and the panel believes that students will be positively impacted by the program's successful implementation. The project is recommended for partial funding of \$121,000, a reduction of \$2,500 for supplies, but with full maintenance of the institutional match of \$250 for maintenance.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Allen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy for Chemistry 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 0 (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 4 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 1 (of 5 points)
B.2 7 (of 18 points)
B.3 8 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (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 4 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

39

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,000
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 is a weak, unfocused proposal. It lacked details regarding implementation and assessment of the outcomes, and had no measurable goals and objectives. The budget justification lacked details. The description of the activities to be conducted with the instrument and the need for a GC/MS were not compelling. The panel does not recommend this project for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katrina Jordan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Preparing 21st Century Teachers for 21st Century
Classrooms: Acquisition and Use of New Technologies

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 9 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 18 points)
 B.3 19 (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)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$104,081
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$104,081

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 with exceptional clarity in the goals, action plans, and budget. Its plan for successful implementation and institutional and other match convinced reviewers that it will significantly improve the quality of teacher education programs at LSU-A through use of modernized technology. The panel recommends full funding of \$104,081.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nathan Ponder

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Mathematics Instruction with Computer Algebra Systems

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 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 0 (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 8 (of 18 points)
B.3 10 (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 _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

52

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$77,219
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's primary goals, to install a computer lab and integrate computer algebra systems (CAS) in the math curriculum in LSU-A's new Multipurpose Academic Center, are good. However, it was not clear to reviewers (1) how math majors will be compared, (2) how Maple 14 software will be incorporated into lectures, and (3) how the software will improve student mastery and performance, critical thinking, etc. The PI should have justified the request for personnel training with further details since the RFP guidelines disallow funding for certain types of training. Additional documentation and references would have benefitted this proposal greatly. As it stands, this project is not recommended for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary Boucher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Education and Research Capabilities in Applied Physics at LSUS

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 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 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

79

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$13,583
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$13,583

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 PIs of this modest proposal seek a few computers, other equipment, and some student research stipends to engage undergraduates in applied physics projects. The applicants have a track record of conducting such applied projects in a variety of areas, and the additional equipment will have a positive impact on several courses. Full funding of \$13,583 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kui Chen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory Course at LSU-Shreveport

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 4 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$34,848
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$34,848

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.)

Despite the fact that this proposal is generally well written, the section entitled Impact on Faculty Development is less so. Nevertheless, enhancement of the analytical chemistry laboratory will have a major impact on education and student development. The program also has a good outreach presentation and will have a positive impact on industry and the community. The proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013UG-11

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Maria Calzada

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: 24/7 Computer Mathematics Labs for All Students

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 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 16 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

91

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$79,156
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$46,374

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 nicely written proposal. Reviewers noted the continuation of the Department's philosophy from the 1998 reform of calculus, including technology use in the classroom, group activities, and the addition of a lab hour for multidisciplinary activities with biology, physics, and chemistry faculty. It is an obvious step for the students to have 24/7 access to a virtual lab. Having the Matlab director teach classes is also a nice component, and the project team seems well rounded. However, reviewers considered the Virtual Mathematics Lab of higher priority, likely to have a greater impact on more students, than the Computational Science Lab. The panel thus recommends partial funding of \$46,374 to be divided among budget categories at the PIs' discretion. The University match for salaries should be maintained since it provides summer support for the PI and substantial match for the Co-PIs, both critical to the success of the project. The \$10,488 institutional match for equipment may be reduced proportionally to the reduced equipment budget.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014UG-11

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynn Koplitz

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Absorption Spectrophotometer Upgrades for Essential Support of Teaching and Research

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 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 7 (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 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$45,064
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$45,064

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 should have a significant impact on teaching and education at Loyola University. Acquiring an absorption spectrophotometer should strengthen student education and research. The integration of the instrument into curricula is well described, and the PI made a clear case of need for the instrument. However, the proposal had some weaknesses: there was no clear evidence of recognized departmental eminence, and the impact on faculty development section was not well presented. Additionally, more information should have been provided on housing of the instrument. Nevertheless, the proposal is recommended for full funding of \$45,064.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015UG-11

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Meyer

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrumentation to Support Organic and Advanced
Chemistry Laboratory Courses

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 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 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

77

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$19,046
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$19,046

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

The proposal was well written despite that fact that the Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact section was weak. The panel noted that the applicant described the project as having a significant impact on teaching and education, and the work plan is good. This modest proposal is recommended for full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016UG-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Melissa Goldsmith

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Curriculum and Instruction Materials for Collaborative Learning Space Dedicated to Music Education/Teaching of Music

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)

G. Total Score:

88

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (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)

F.1 Yes x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$40,115

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$40,115

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-planned project clearly supports several aspects of teacher preparation that are not usually addressed adequately in other proposals. The proposed space that would be dedicated to the teaching of music and music education should enable students to hold experiential practicum teaching and learning discussions in music instruction, to learn collaboratively and explore approaches to reading music notation, and to work with special needs students. The proposal could have been strengthened by greater attention to stating its goals in clearer, more measurable terms. Even though some goals could have been expressed in a different manner, full funding of \$40,115 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017UG-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ianna West

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Pre-Professional Development Center for Technology-Enhanced Instruction in Mathematics and the Sciences

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (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 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$72,640
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$72,640

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 was nicely written. The PI states that 1,000–1,100 students each semester will be positively impacted by the project. Experimenting with the success of MyMathLab is a good approach, and using the course management tool to improve course completion rates is commendable. The panel noted that the breakdown of upper-level objectives and lower-level (general education) objectives seems very feasible. The proposal is recommended for full funding of \$72,640.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018UG-11

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Phil Brown

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Through an Enhanced Program Candidates Are to Earn
Additional Science, Technology, Engineering and
Mathematics Certification for Teaching Project Lead The Way
Middle and High School 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 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 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 18 points)
 B.3 19 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (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 12 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No x

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: \$90,821
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$90,821

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 and -developed proposal is based on an existing and effective Project Lead the Way®, a science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) program for pre-service teachers, and undergraduate and graduate students. Many high and middle schools in Louisiana are already using PLTW courses with their students. Graduates of the program are awarded not only Louisiana teaching licenses, but also PLTW completion certificates. While full funding is recommended, it is contingent on the NSU curriculum review committee’s approval of the new courses. This approval must be addressed to Ms. Carrie Robison, BoR Sponsored Programs Administrator, via e-mail to Ms. Noreen Lackett (noreen.lackett@la.gov), before contract negotiations in late April 2011.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019UG-11

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kioh Kim

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Student Teaching in South Korea

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 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 8 (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 14 (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)

F.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: \$75,640
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 innovative proposal could have been strengthened with greater clarity regarding the criteria to be used in the selection of teacher education candidates from the applicant pool at NSU and ULL. The plan is to send 15 pre-service students to South Korea for four months to student teach and take one course. Project goals and objectives could have been described in more clearly measurable terms. Despite the match from South Korea, the budget seemed a little excessive (\$1,000 a month for four months for 15 student stipends for a total of \$60,000). Lack of clarity and other doubts regarding the project's limited impact caused concerns for the reviewers. The panel could have recommended some funding for this project if it had been a little more modest and if there were some type of institutional match. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020UG-11

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leigh Myers

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Engaging Students in Discrete Mathematics

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a 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 17 (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)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

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: \$130,761
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$125,361

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 use of finite mathematics serves a large number of students in this project. The instructional materials created by faculty from NSU faculty is a positive idea, ensuring that while the material must be sound content-wise, the presentation is geared toward Northwestern's clientele. This project is recommended for slightly reduced funding of \$125,361. In order to be able to complete the project and enhance courses with technology-rich lessons, the panel does recommend modest summer support for the faculty members since it is very well justified. The project team should determine where the budget should be modified to accommodate the reduction.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021UG-11

INSTITUTION: Saint Joseph Seminary College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jude Lupinetti

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Smartboards for Classrooms

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 18 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$20,606
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$20,606

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 would have fared better had the required Biographical Sketch form and the Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact discussion been submitted with the other required information. Nevertheless, the panel recommends full funding because of the great need to bring this College into the electronic age.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022UG-11

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jean Fotie

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digitalization of Teaching Laboratories at Southeastern Louisiana University

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 18 points)
B.3 19 (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 11 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$47,529
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$47,529

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 with achievable goals and a strong implementation plan. The panel agrees with the PIs' claim that the project will have a significant impact on student development and education. This program was well thought out and the faculty expertise is strong. The panel recommends funding of the entire \$47,529 request.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023UG-11

INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: William Parkinson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Emphasizing Data Analysis in Undergraduate Physics Laboratories

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (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 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (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 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.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: \$31,769
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$31,769

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 PIs propose to emphasize data analysis and interpretation in a variety of settings, including a new stand-alone computer lab. New courses and curricular activities that would allow students to get valuable experience in these very important skills were described in detail. A variety of sample experiments utilizing these techniques and metrics to check for student progress were included. The panel especially noted the SCALE-UP experiences of the Co-PI as being a valuable source of faculty and staff expertise. Full funding of \$31,769 is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 024UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Willia Moore

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Reconfigured Computer Laboratory for Teacher Preparation

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$85,567
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 institution is ineligible to submit proposals in the Undergraduate Enhancement Program competition. Thus, this proposal was not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 025UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Biruk Alemayehu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Policy Initiatives and Public Housing in the New Orleans Metropolitan Area: Pre- and Post-Hurricane Katrina

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

43

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$39,032
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 altruistic project is a request to research and analyze public-housing challenges faced by low-income, post-Katrina families. The following costs are listed: 2 months summer salary for an assistant professor plus fringe benefits totaling \$15,507; conference travel expenses and student stipends totaling \$7,000; travel expenses for the Co-PI totaling \$3,800; and over \$15,000 for state-of-the-art equipment and DBMS software to establish and disseminate research findings. Although the goal of faculty and student research to examine public housing documentation, and of surveying and interviewing participants in individual programs that affect low-income families, is noble, it could be accomplished during the academic year, thus negating the need for summer salaries and benefits. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 026UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Glenda Allen-Jones

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project M.A.C.K. (Males Acquiring Classroom Knowledge)

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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 23 points)
 B.3 17 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes No x

F. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$39,820 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount	<u> \$27,300 </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 application describes a laudable effort to retain students who are at higher risk than average for dropping out of the teacher preparation program. The proposal could have been strengthened by greater specificity regarding the criteria to be used in selecting students for the program. The panel recommends partial funding of \$27,300 by reducing funds designated for PI support and fringe, student stipends, public relations materials used for marketing the project, and conference costs.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 027UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Timotea Bailey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Access, Retention, and Graduation Rate Enhancements

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 5 (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 3 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 23 points)
 B.3 12 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score: 50 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$150,000</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.)

In an idealistic effort to enhance access, retention, and graduation rates of SUNO's CBA students, the PIs seek funds to establish a pilot summer-bridge program in which entering freshmen from the inner city will live in campus housing in a wholesome environment and taking English and mathematics preparartion courses and receiving tutoring, advising and peer mentoring. Along with summer compensation for CBA faculty, an iPad will be given to each student who successfully completes the summer program. Funds are also requested for textbooks, although free books are already provided. The rationale for this is that students often must wait up to three weeks for the free texts to arrive on campus. The panel believes that these worthwhile outcomes could be better incorporated into a First-Year Experience/Freshmen Seminar Program. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 028UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlie Johnson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Educational Technology and Academic Learning Laboratory

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (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 16 (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)

F.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: \$136,972

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$101,472

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 well-developed proposal from SUNO's College of Education faculty that when successfully implemented should strengthen the technology capabilities of future teachers. The panel appreciates the amount of detail in this proposal's budget and justification compared with other budget requests from the same institution. Partial funding of \$101,472 is recommended for equipment, software, supplies and installation, but not for faculty salaries/stipends, fringe benefits, or travel.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 029UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Vincent Johnson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using Technology to Enhance Pedagogy for Disabled Student Learners

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 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 0 (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 12 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (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)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score:

56

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$66,325
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 could have been strengthened had the PI incorporated greater detail and specificity in the Enhancement Plan section. The goals and objectives listed under the Enhancement Plan are not measurable (e.g., "(1) to give the faculty of the College of Education pedagogical tools; (2) enhance the curricula of the College of Education with resources for disabled students . . .") In addition, failure to include the required Biographical Sketch forms and to address the Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact section negatively affected the panel's composite final score. Funding of this project is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 030UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heon Kim

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Student Success in Mathematics

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 9 (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 66 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 23 points)
 B.3 13 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (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)

E.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score: 64 (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>\$62,092</u>	<u>\$45,912</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.)

While enhancing student performance in Math 118, College Mathematics, is an important objective, this proposal does not appear to be sustainable. The proposal itself was poorly written. It was not clear why the faculty team wants to create its own database of questions from the course textbook. Did the PIs investigate existing software? The reviewers also had a serious concern regarding maintenance of the system to be created, especially if the creators leave the University. Additionally, as in many other proposals from SUNO during this cycle, the budget request was primarily for faculty salaries, fringe and student travel expenses without much justification. For these reasons this project is not recommended for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 031UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tchavdar Marinov

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Undergraduate Enhancement Research in Ordinary
Differential Equations

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 12 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 23 points)
 B.3 10 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score: 59 (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>\$67,533</u>	<u>\$32,533</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.)

While the proposal is innovative, it appeared to reviewers to be, in many respects, a research proposal benefiting only one faculty member. Therefore, it did not impact a large number of students and it did not promote professional development of SUNO's mathematics faculty. Also unclear was how this project would help with the recruitment of new majors since there were no measurable goals or objectives. The proposal should have been broader in scope and more inclusive of other departmental faculty. This proposal is not recommended for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 032UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project to Equip CBA Lecture Hall at SUNO

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 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 18 points)
 B.3 9 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (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)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$88,807
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 seeks AACSB accreditation for the College of Business and Public Administration. SUNO's efforts to achieve certification would be enhanced by adding additional computers to the college technology infrastructure that would complement existing resources. MIS faculty and students, the PIs claim, would benefit from an improved lecture hall with 95 new computer workstations and some Smart classroom devices and supplies to teach three 100-level courses in the new CBA building. The reviewers found no measurable goals and objectives in the narrative section. The budget request was unrealistic and inflated. Since SUNO already has acquired significant computer facilities, funding for this project is not recommended. The reviewers do compliment the PIs of this proposal since it contained no request for faculty salaries, fringe, travel or student support.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 033UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project to Implement Smart Classrooms in CBA at SUNO

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 5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 8 (of 18 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (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)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$172,789
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 an equipment request to update two computer rooms with 35 computers each as Southern University-New Orleans' College of Business Administration seeks AACSB accreditation. Although the applicant states, "There is no usable equipment on hand for this project. The computers in the one Post-Katrina undergraduate computer lab are either non-functioning or obsolete," other computer laboratories do exist. At \$172,789, the proposal's budget, which requests 75 desktop computers at \$1,618 each (five of these are for faculty) and 70 computer workstations at \$534 each, seems unrealistic and inflated. The panel does not recommend funding the project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 034UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Muhammed Miah

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Undergraduate MIS Program via Student and Faculty Research Using GIS

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____
A.2 5 (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 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
D.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

F. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 23 points)
B.3 15 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes _____ No x

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	\$104,911	\$50,000
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

This is an ambitious proposal to update a current 26-computer Geographical Information Systems (GIS) lab funded through previous grants, and acquire laptops to enhance MIS faculty's research and professional development at SUNO. Its goals are to study the performance of small businesses located in Orleans Parish, pre- and post-Katrina, to correlate the findings with census data, and to identify potential optimum locations for the establishment of new businesses. Although the PIs state that the objectives are measurable, not one of the nine objectives is truly measurable (e.g., the third objective reads "incorporating GIS contents and tools in existing courses"). The PIs seek sophisticated GIS data collection (global positioning systems) and portable equipment, along with faculty summer salaries during both years and compensation for two undergraduate assistants. Since a current lab exists and free tracking systems like Google Maps are easily accessible online, funding is not recommended for this project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 035UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katherine Robinson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Interdisciplinary Student Engagement Curriculum

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 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 no score (of 5 points)
B.2 no score (of 23 points)
B.3 no score (of 25 points)
B.4 no score (of 5 points)
B.5 no score (of 2 points)
B.6 no score (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score: 28 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$143,785
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 narrative was fairly well written, this proposal did not include the required Budget Narrative or Justification, thus the panel could not score the Enhancement Plan or the budget. Additionally, the cover and budget pages stated that the request for BoRSF support was \$12.7 million (an amount about eight times more than is allotted to the entire Undergraduate Enhancement Subprogram during this cycle). Over twelve and a half million dollars of that amount is primarily for faculty development activities like mini-conferences and workshops/meetings, with no institutional match. This large request is obviously a mistake that should have been rectified by institutional personnel if they were serious about submitting this proposal. The review panel cannot fund faculty development expenses without knowing how many faculty will be paid to attend.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 036UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Singleton

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Mathematics Multimedia Curriculum at SUNO

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 6 (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 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 23 points)
B.3 14 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes x No

F. Total Score: 57 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$151,935

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 the proposal was nicely written, it was unclear to reviewers if all of the objectives could be achieved in the allotted time. The Recognition of Faculty Eminence section needed additional details. Also unclear was how the faculty would receive information about the project and how they would be included in the project to make it more of a departmental effort. For these reasons the panel could not recommend the proposal for funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 037UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Delin Tan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Build a Mathematics Learning System in SUNO that Could Reduce Students' Math Failure Rate and Enhance Their Study Quality

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

G. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 18 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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)

F.1 Yes x No _____

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$105,299</u>	<u>\$0</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$89,499</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 is a well-organized and -written proposal. The information about the new software system was insightful and informative. It showed forethought, which demonstrates that there is a good chance that the system will be successfully created and easily maintained. This project is recommended for partial funding of \$89,499. Funding for travel expenses and student stipends is not recommended. The institutional match should be maintained in full since it covers faculty summer support that is critical to the success of the project.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 038UG-11

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Obyung Kwun

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Study of Student Attitude Toward Online Courses and Their Behavior in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)

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 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 0 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 5 (of 23 points)
B.3 5 (of 25 points)
B.4 0 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 0 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes _____ No x

F. Total Score: 30 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$33,750
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.)

Southern University-New Orleans' MIS faculty members, who research and publish together, seek sophisticated equipment (mini laptops for six faculty and Avacast Web conferencing software), one month of PI summer support, monies for research and conference/workshop attendance, and \$1,200 to submit findings to national and international e-learning journals. The goal of developing a theoretical model to explain factors that influence student attitudes and intentions of taking online courses did not seem compelling to the panel. Better foci might have been on marketing, recruiting and retaining online students. No funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 039UG-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Radhey Srivastava

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Glove Box for Teaching and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$48,220
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 institution is ineligible to submit proposals in the Undergraduate Enhancement Program competition. Thus, this proposal was not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 040UG-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emad El-Giar

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Introduction of Electrochemical Techniques to ULM's
Chemistry Program

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 _____ (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$62,787
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 institution is ineligible to submit proposals in the Undergraduate Enhancement Program competition. Thus, this proposal was not scored.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 041UG-11

INSTITUTION: Xavier University of Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mark Quinn

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Xavier University Student Small Business Incubator

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 9 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 23 points)
 B.3 19 (of 25 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 6 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	Requested Amount:
	<u>\$91,987</u>	<u>\$49,810</u>
	Recommended Amount:	Recommended Amount:
	<u>\$32,478</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.)

Xavier University, an historically Black Catholic University of 3,338 students in New Orleans, seeks to foster and accelerate the growth and success of small businesses by creating one of the first student-run small-business incubators in New Orleans. This worthy endeavor hopes to seek microloans and technical assistance for micro-enterprises. Another goal is to help Xavier become the "hub," providing key network connections, advice and entrepreneurship coaching to increase student persistence and alumni success. Xavier's current enrollment is 85 percent of its pre-Katrina enrollment, and the PIs hope that more students will view entrepreneurship as a viable career opportunity as New Orleans rebuilds. The incubator, as proposed, might improve curricular offerings and draw prospective students. Although funding of faculty summer salaries and travel compensation for PIs are not recommended by the panel, the equipment request portion is recommended for funding of \$32,478 in year one only.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 042UG-11

INSTITUTION: Xavier University of Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cheryl Stevens

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Transformation of the Undergraduate Biochemistry Lab
Course at Xavier University of Louisiana

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 23 points)
B.3 19 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

E.1 Yes x No _____

F. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$118,127
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$118,127

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 believes that successful completion of this project will have a positive impact on student education at Xavier. The assessment of the program, however, was weakly developed. How the program will be supported financially in the long term is unclear. Nevertheless, the program is recommended for full funding despite concerns about sustainability.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 043UG-11

INSTITUTION: Xavier University of Louisiana

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Wesselmann

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Maximizing Physics: A Comprehensive Strategy for the Enhancement of Physics Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (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 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$93,700
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$46,200

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.)

A request for equipment to enhance the educational experiences of physics majors and non-majors at a variety of pedagogical levels is made in this proposal. The panel finds the impact of equipment for lower-level and more introductory "service-type" courses in astronomy and algebra-based physics compelling. However, the reviewers consider the impact of more specialized requests for upper-level laboratories and a proposed numerical analysis course less obvious. Partial funding is recommended in the amount of \$46,200, which covers the first three requested items: the astronomy demonstration equipment (\$2,100), the astronomy observation equipment (\$11,100) and the general physics laboratory equipment (\$33,000).

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Type of Proposal(E-Equipment, NE-Non-Equipment)	New/Continuation	Duration (years)	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
001UG-11	Brownholland,David	Centenary College	Chemistry	E	N	1	Mainstreaming Air-Free Synthetic Techniques in Undergraduate Laboratories	\$50,408.00	\$0.00	\$50,408.00
002UG-11	Sikes,Helen	Centenary College	Business	E	N	1	Student Learning Through Service: One Tax Return at a Time An Enhancement of the Centenary College Accounting Program & the Frost School of Business Volunteer Tax Assistance Program	\$93,406.00	\$0.00	\$93,406.00
003UG-11	Duplessis,Raymond	Delgado Community College	Chemistry	E	N	1	Chemistry/Biochemistry Lab Tech Enhancement	\$105,582.00	\$0.00	\$105,582.00
004UG-11	Frickey,Dena	Delgado Community College	Mathematics	E	N	1	Developmental Math Redesign	\$266,770.00	\$0.00	\$266,770.00
005UG-11	Caston,Sonya	Dillard University	Chemistry	E	N	1	Enhancing the Analytical Chemistry and Instrumental Analysis Lecture and Laboratory Experience	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
006UG-11	Dai,Hong	Dillard University	Mathematics	E	C LEQSF(2008-09)- ENHUG-10	1	ENHANCEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE ACTUARIAL SCIENCES, PHASE-IV (UAS-IV)	\$67,000.00	\$0.00	\$67,000.00
007UG-11	Ohene, Frank	Grambling State University	Chemistry	E	N	1	Acquisition of High Performance Liquid Chromatography and Capillary Electrophoresis for the Integration of Hands-on Separation Techniques into the Chemistry Curriculum.	\$123,500.00	\$0.00	\$123,500.00
008UG-11	Allen, John	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	Chemistry	E	N	1	Gas Chromatography/Mass Spectroscopy for Chemistry Courses	\$78,000.00	\$0.00	\$78,000.00
009UG-11	Jordan, Katrina	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	Education	E	N	1	Preparing 21st Century Teachers for 21st Century Classrooms: Acquisition and Use of New Technologies	\$104,081.00	\$0.00	\$104,081.00
010UG-11	Ponder, Nathan	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria	Mathematics	E	N	1	Enhancing Mathematics Instruction with Computer Algebra Systems	\$77,219.00	\$0.00	\$77,219.00
011UG-11	Boucher, Gary	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	Physics/Astronomy	E	N	1	Enhancing Student Education & Research Capabilities in Applied Physics at LSU	\$13,583.00	\$0.00	\$13,583.00
012UG-11	Chen, Kui	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport	Chemistry	E	N	1	Enhancement of the Analytical Chemistry Laboratory Course at LSU-Shreveport	\$34,848.00	\$0.00	\$34,848.00
013UG-11	Calzada, Maria	Loyola University New Orleans	Mathematics	E	N	1	24/7 COMPUTER MATHEMATICS LABS FOR ALL STUDENTS	\$79,156.00	\$0.00	\$79,156.00
014UG-11	Koplitz, Lynn	Loyola University New Orleans	Chemistry	E	N	1	Absorption Spectrophotometer Upgrades for Essential Support of Teaching and Research Instrumentation to Support Organic and Advanced Chemistry Laboratory Courses	\$45,064.00	\$0.00	\$45,064.00
015UG-11	Meyer, James	Loyola University New Orleans	Chemistry	E	N	1	Instrumentation to Support Organic and Advanced Chemistry Laboratory Courses	\$19,046.00	\$0.00	\$19,046.00
016UG-11	Goldsmith, Melissa	Nicholls State University	Education	E	N	1	Curriculum and Instruction Materials for Collaborative Learning Space Dedicated to Music Education/Teaching of Music	\$40,115.00	\$0.00	\$40,115.00
017UG-11	West, Ianna	Nicholls State University	Mathematics	E	N	1	A Pre-Professional Development Center for Technology-Enhanced Instruction in Mathematics and the Sciences	\$72,640.00	\$0.00	\$72,640.00

Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Type of Proposal (E-Equipment, NE-Non-Equipment)	New/Continuation	Duration (years)	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
018UG-11	Brown, Phil	Northwestern State University	Education	E	N	1	Through an Enhanced Program Candidates Are to Earn Additional Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Certification for Teaching Project Lead The Way Middle and High School Courses	\$90,821.00	\$0.00	\$90,821.00
019UG-11	Kim, Kioh	Northwestern State University	Education	E	N	1	Student Teaching in South Korea	\$75,640.00	\$0.00	\$75,640.00
020UG-11	Myers, Leigh	Northwestern State University	Mathematics	E	N	1	Engaging Students in Discrete Mathematics	\$130,761.00	\$0.00	\$130,761.00
021UG-11	Lupinetti, Jude	Saint Joseph Seminary College	Education	E	N	1	Smartboards for Classrooms	\$20,606.00	\$0.00	\$20,606.00
022UG-11	FOTIE, Jean	Southeastern Louisiana University	Chemistry	E	N	2	Digitalization of Teaching Laboratories at Southeastern Louisiana University	\$47,529.00	\$0.00	\$47,529.00
023UG-11	Parkinson, William	Southeastern Louisiana University	Physics/Astronomy	E	N	1	Emphasizing Data Analysis in Undergraduate Physics Laboratories	\$31,769.00	\$0.00	\$31,769.00
024UG-11	Moore, Willia	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	Education	E	N	1	A Reconfigured Computer Laboratory for Teacher Preparation	\$85,567.00	\$0.00	\$85,567.00
025UG-11	Alemayehu, Biruk	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	E	N	1	Policy Initiatives and Public Housing in the New Orleans Metropolitan Area: Pre- and Post-Hurricane Katrina	\$39,032.00	\$0.00	\$39,032.00
026UG-11	Allen-Jones, Glenda	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Education	NE	N	1	Project M.A.C.K. (Males Acquiring Classroom Knowledge)	\$39,820.00	\$0.00	\$39,820.00
027UG-11	Bailey, Timotea	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	NE	N	2	Access, Retention, and Graduation Rate Enhancements	\$150,000.00	\$0.00	\$150,000.00
028UG-11	Johnson, Charlie	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Education	E	N	1	Educational Technology and Academic Learning Laboratory	\$136,972.00	\$0.00	\$136,972.00
029UG-11	Johnson, Vincent	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Education	NE	N	1	Using Technology to Enhance Pedagogy for Disabled Student Learners	\$66,325.00	\$0.00	\$66,325.00
030UG-11	Kim, Heon	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Mathematics	NE	N	2	Enhancing Student Success in Mathematics	\$62,092.00	\$45,912.00	\$108,004.00
031UG-11	Marinov, Tchavdar	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Mathematics	NE	N	2	Undergraduate Enhancement Research in Ordinary Differential Equations	\$67,533.00	\$32,533.00	\$100,066.00
032UG-11	Martin, Frank	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	E	N	1	Project to Equip CBA Lecture Hall at SUNO	\$88,807.00	\$0.00	\$88,807.00
033UG-11	Martin, Frank	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	E	N	1	Project to Implement Smart Classrooms in CBA at SUNO	\$172,789.00	\$0.00	\$172,789.00
034UG-11	Miah, Muhammed	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	NE	N	2	Enhancement of Undergraduate MIS Program via Student and Faculty Research using GIS	\$104,911.00	\$50,000.00	\$154,911.00
035UG-11	Robinson, Katherine	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Education	NE	N	1	An interdisciplinary Student Engagement Curriculum	\$143,785.00	\$0.00	\$143,785.00

Proposals Submitted to the Undergraduate Enhancement Program
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal #	PI Name	Institution	Discipline	Type of Proposal (E-Equipment, NE-Non-Equipment)	New/Continuation	Duration (years)	Project Title	Amount Requested		
								Year 1	Year 2	Total
036UG-11	Singleton, Cynthia	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Mathematics	NE	C LEQSF (2008-2009) ENHUG-29	1	Enhancing the Mathematics Multimedia Curriculum at SUNO	\$151,935.00	\$0.00	\$151,935.00
037UG-11	Tan, Delin	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Mathematics	E	N	2	Build a mathematics learning system in SUNO that could reduce students' math failure rate and enhance their study quality	\$105,299.00	\$0.00	\$105,299.00
038UG-11	kwun, obyung	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans	Business	NE	N	1	Study of Student Attitude toward Online Courses and Their Behavior in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU)	\$33,750.00	\$0.00	\$33,750.00
039UG-11	Srivastava, Radhey	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Chemistry	E	N	1	Acquisition of Glove Box for Teaching and Research	\$48,220.00	\$0.00	\$48,220.00
040UG-11	El-Giar, Emad	University of Louisiana at Monroe	Chemistry	E	N	1	Introduction of Electrochemical Techniques to ULM's Chemistry Program	\$62,787.00	\$0.00	\$62,787.00
041UG-11	Quinn, Mark	Xavier University	Business	NE	N	2	Xavier Univ Student Small Business Incubator	\$91,987.00	\$49,810.00	\$141,797.00
042UG-11	Stevens, Cheryl	Xavier University	Chemistry	NE	N	1	Transformation of the Undergraduate Biochemistry Lab Course at Xavier University of Louisiana	\$118,127.00	\$0.00	\$118,127.00
043UG-11	Wesselmann, Frank	Xavier University	Physics/Astronomy	E	N	1	Maximizing Physics: A Comprehensive Strategy for the Enhancement of Physics Learning	\$93,700.00	\$0.00	\$93,700.00

*The RFP restricts second year funding requests to no more than \$50,000.

Total Number of Proposals submitted	43
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$3,560,982.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$178,255.00
Total Money Requested	\$3,739,237.00

APPENDIX B

Proposal Evaluation Forms

Form 1: For Purchase of Instructional and Research Equipment

Form 2: For Other Than Equipment Purchases

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: _____

**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_____ | 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: _____