

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS**

**IN**

**COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES**

**February 27, 2012**

**Prepared by:**

Dr. John T. Gorgone, Chair  
Bentley University

Dr. John Trimble  
Howard University

2011-2012 Board of Regents Support Fund (BoRSF) Enhancement Program  
Computer and Information Sciences

A Computer and Information Sciences Review Panel consisting of Professor John Trimble, Howard University (Department of Systems and Computer Science), and Professor Emeritus John T. Gorgone, chair, Bentley University (Department of Computer Information Systems), was formed in December 2011. The Review Panel met via the Internet, e-mail, and conference calls during the months of January and February 2012 for the purpose of evaluating twenty (20) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement subprogram of the Board of Regents Support Fund. A final teleconference call was held on February 27, 2012.

The Review Panel received the following material prior to the visit: a) twenty (20) Computer & Information Sciences proposals to be evaluated; b) a summary of proposals listing proposal number, title, principal investigator(s) involved, institution, money requested, duration of request, etc; c) the FY 2011-12 Enhancement RFP with appendices; and d) twenty (20) proposal evaluation forms.

Individual Review Panel members read the materials, assessed the proposals and tentatively completed the rating form for each proposal prior to the first teleconference. The Panel discussed each proposal and transformed the individual tentative ratings into a composite Panel rating over a series of teleconferences. The Panel then prepared comprehensive rankings and discussed in detail the recommended proposals. Given the extremely limited funds, the Panel repeatedly reviewed the budget details of fundable proposals until available monies were completely distributed. The Panel then completed its final report. Each proposal was reviewed and discussed in detail by the Panel. The Panel unanimously agreed on all final decisions regarding each proposal, and it was felt that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP (See Appendix B).

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget, which resulted in a recommended amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. If additional monies become available after each proposal is funded at the recommended amount, Table I proposals should be funded up to the level requested in rank order. Table II includes proposals deemed fundable but recommended for funding only if further additional monies become available after all Table I proposals are funded in full. Table III includes proposals not recommended for funding. Table IV includes proposals that, based on the Panel's assessment, did not represent direct, tangible enhancement to Computer and Information Sciences departments, programs or faculties, and may be more appropriately submitted under other disciplines. These proposals were deemed ineligible and not rated by the Panel.

First-year requests totaling \$2,124,212 were submitted to the Panel. First-year awards totaling \$319,842 for six (6) proposals in Table I were recommended by the Panel, to be funded in full at a level of \$660,841 if funds become available. An additional \$224,286 is recommended for the two (2) proposals listed in Table II, if additional funds become available.

The tables are followed by individual rating forms with a detailed review of each proposal. Appendix A contains a list of proposals submitted for funding consideration, Appendix B contains a copy of the rating forms used by the Panel.

**Traditional Enhancement Computer and Information Sciences Table I  
Highly Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	89	04CIS-12	LSU-BR	\$66,750	\$32,500		
2	88	07CIS-12	LaTech	\$143,482	\$70,000		
3	87	20CIS-12	UNO	\$174,400	\$75,000		
4	86	15CIS-12	UL-L	\$46,802	\$35,000		
5	84	08CIS-12	LaTech	\$118,208	\$51,100		
6	83	09CIS-12	SU-BR	\$111,199	\$56,242	\$19,200	\$0
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$660,841</b>	<b>\$319,842</b>	<b>\$19,200</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Traditional Enhancement Computer and Information Sciences Table II  
Recommended for Funding if Funds Become Available**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
7	79	18CIS-12	UL-L	\$128,397	\$128,397		
8	74	06CIS-12	LSU-S	\$95,889	\$95,889		
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$224,286</b>	<b>\$224,286</b>		

**Traditional Enhancement Computer and Information Sciences Table III  
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
9	73	14CIS-12	UL-L	\$60,498	\$0		
10	70	17CIS-12	UL-L	\$59,513	\$0		
11	64	03CIS-12	LSU-BR	\$86,841	\$0		
11	64	19CIS-12	UL-L	\$132,000	\$0		
13	60	01CIS-12	Dillard	\$105,341	\$0		
13	60	12CIS-12	Tulane	\$122,241	\$0	\$49,400	\$0
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$566,434</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$49,400</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Traditional Enhancement Computer and Information Sciences Table IV  
Proposals Ruled Ineligible**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
	N/A	02CIS-12	LSU-BR	\$202,150	\$0		
	N/A	05CIS-12	LSU-BR	\$135,000	\$0		
	N/A	10CIS-12	SU-BR	\$26,143	\$0		
	N/A	11CIS-12	SU-BR	\$88,156	\$0	\$24,000	\$0
	N/A	13CIS-12	TUHSC	\$129,695	\$0		
	N/A	16CIS-12	UL-L	\$91,507	\$0		
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$672,651</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$24,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01CIS-12

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhanced Learning Environment and Infrastructure for  
Computer Science Gateway Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lynda Louis

**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 8 (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 11 (of 18 points)  
 B.3 0 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ 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: \$105,341  
 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 request seeks to enhance infrastructure of the Computer Science curriculum with 62 Dell computers, accessories and software. The proposal's "short-term goal is to retool the classrooms with state-of-the art technology for deployment for the fall 2012 school term." The request is for fundamental infrastructure to meet the most basic needs of the University. It does not have a unique or creative component. The work plan should be more detailed, particularly in regard to curriculum development. It appears the equipment will be widely used by both Computer Science and non-Computer Science majors. No evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence is given at a regional level or otherwise. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Media Research and Development Studio

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Margaret Herster

## 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)

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

G. Total Score: 

N/A
-----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$202,150  
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 will augment existing digital media development resources and enhance opportunities for shared research between faculty and graduate students affiliated with the Arts, Visualization, Advanced Technologies & Research (AVATAR) program at LSU. The applicant requests a significant amount of money. The project appears to have limited impact on Computer Science students and Computer Science courses, and focuses primarily on study outside of the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A 4K Stereoscopic LCD Wall for Education and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Kooima

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

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

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$86,841  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The PI proposes the acquisition and classroom installation of a large-scale, high-resolution, stereoscopic 3D LCD display wall for use in education, scientific visualization, and computer graphics research. Faculty involved have well-established publication records in the fields of high-performance visualization applications and display systems. This project appears to have a very limited impact on Computer Sciences curriculum, students and faculty. While the PI indicates that "with this proposal we seek to both enhance interactive visualization at LSU and help extend interactive visualization from the research lab to the classroom and to the curriculum itself" and indicates three Computer Science and two non-Computer Science classes that would use this equipment, it is not clear how widely this equipment will be used or how critical it is to these courses, since they are all currently being taught. The described rationale and impact are limited. The enhancement plan does not present a strong case for suitability and quality of enhancements in the Computer Sciences. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak and not convincing. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Cybersecurity Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: David Koppelman

**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     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    16    (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    11    (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.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.)

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>    \$66,750    </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>    \$32,500    </u>

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

The Electrical & Computer Engineering (ECE) and Computer Science (CS) Departments seek equipment for a cyber security lab to perform realistic investigations into host-based techniques to defend against cyber attack and which can be used for undergraduate and graduate instruction. This is a high national priority area and the project involves multiple departments with strong faculty input from both. It should impact a number of graduate and undergraduate students. ECE is one of the largest departments in LSU's College of Engineering, and the CS Department has been nationally ranked. The work plan and the lab description are both very detailed. The PIs will perform a wide range of experiments covering significant cyber security issues. This project involves new and existing undergraduate and graduate courses in both departments. The statements on economic impact and potential eminence could be stronger. There is no institutional match. Given the extremely limited resources for this cycle, reduced funding is recommended, with full funding recommended if monies become available. Budget reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Solar Energy Supplied Computer Cluster for Research and Instruction

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lu Peng

## 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)

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

G. Total Score: 

N/A
-----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$135,000  
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 project proposes to use solar energy as the alternative power supply for computer clusters. The project summary describes how "the global energy crisis" and environmental concerns have "led the IT community into green computing era." The proposal addresses a socially relevant aspect of computing power consumption. It is designed to impact four advanced-level electrical and computing engineering courses, but the effect of the equipment is limited. This project focuses primarily on the study of physics, materials science and electrical engineering disciplines and does not collaborate meaningfully with or enhance student learning in the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Immersive Learning Environment for Enrichment and  
Advancement of Instruction and Student Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Urska Cvek

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 14 (of 18 points)  
B.3 14 (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 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$95,889  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$95,889

(If additional monies become available)

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

The proposal seeks funding for desktop computers and related equipment to support student learning. It does not clearly indicate what courses will use the equipment or why some of the equipment, such as Kinect, a Microsoft surface and three 3D LDTVs, is needed. The enhancement plan does not present a strong case for how the project will directly impact the variety and quality of curriculum, research, students, and faculty of computing. The proposal lacks a stronger case for how this project will catapult the department into attaining a high level of eminence. ABET accreditation is proof of meeting nationally recognized quality program standards in computing, and a loss of this accreditation would demonstrate that the program quality is going in the opposite direction. Full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07CIS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Robotics into the Computer Science Curriculum

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mike O'Neal

**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     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     5     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    16    (of 18 points)  
 B.3    16    (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    11    (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score:** 88 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$143,482</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$70,000</u>

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

This project seeks to integrate robotics into the Computer Science curriculum. The PI is a former department chair and has a strong background in and understanding of the needs of the program. Robotics is being proposed as a unifying theme across the curriculum. This project impacts 18 courses in Computer Science, from freshman to graduate level. While faculty have been doing some work in robotics, this equipment will allow a significant expansion. The measurable objectives are clearly defined. This project has high faculty involvement, including 70% of Computer Science personnel. The major costs are eight humanoid robots (\$127,999) and 10 TurtleBots (\$15,490). The evidence for achieving eminence needs strengthening. Given the extremely limited resources, reduced funding is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately. If additional monies become available, full funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08CIS-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Smart Mobile Device Forensics Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tom Roberts

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

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

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$118,208  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$51,100

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

The project will establish a mobile device forensics laboratory to support multiple courses for the information assurance sequence and base courses in Computer and Information Sciences (CIS). The lab will impact four upper-level and three graduate courses in CIS, and at least two non-CIS courses. Growth in smart mobile devices is completely changing the computer forensics environment. The enhancement plan does present a reasonable case for how the project will directly impact the variety and quality of curriculum, students, and faculty. A reasonable argument can be made for eminence and national job placement, as well as an emerging national recognition in the field of information assurance. AACSB accreditation is evidence of meeting nationally recognized quality program standards. The attainment of the "National Center of Academic Excellence in Information Systems Security Education" designation, one of only 106 institutions to achieve the designation from the National Security Agency and Department of Homeland Security, is additional evidence of achieving regional and emerging national eminence. Funding is recommended at a reduced level given small amount of funds available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately. Full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Developing a High Performance Data Processing Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shuju Bai

**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 2 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 16 (of 18 points)  
 B.3 15 (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 9 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$111,199</u>	<u>\$19,200</u>
		<u>\$56,242</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks funds to develop a high performance data managing, processing, mining and image processing lab in the Computer Science (CS) Department. This will strengthen its capability of educating minority students in engineering and CS, and to conduct research in related areas. The proposal requests funding for hardware (servers, workstations, network printer) and software (Oracle 11g, Matlab, Gaussian, MySQL) to facilitate courses and research. The lab will be used by several other departments such as Electrical and Mechanical Engineering. The economic impact is average. The work plan sufficiently describes the activities to be undertaken to achieve the proposal's goals. The enhancement plan provides a detailed schedule of activities. The proposal could be improved by providing a stronger case for how this project will catapult the department into attaining a high level of eminence. There is no institutional match. Funding is recommended at a reduced level given the small pool of funds available, with full funding recommended for year one if additional funds become available. Reductions can be made at the discretion of the PI.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computer and Multimedia Technology for Educational Leaders

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jarrett Landor-Ngemi

## 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)

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

G. Total Score: 

N/A
-----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$26,143  
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 funding for technological tools (projector, DVD/VCR, camera, PC and Mac computers, cable, screen, multimedia lectern) to enhance one classroom in the Department of Educational Leadership & Technology. The objectives are to provide students with access to computer-aided instruction and testing preparation materials such as multimedia case studies, video simulations, and drill practice exercises, and to provide faculty with instructional tools. Based on stated objectives this project appears to focus primarily on the study of education and does not collaborate meaningful with or enhance student learning in the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore, it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11CIS-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Southern University Health Information Technology Laboratory (SUHIT)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Victor Mbarika

**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)

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

**G. Total Score:** N/A (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>
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	\$88,156	\$24,000
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	\$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 proposed project seeks to enhance a multimedia lab dedicated to developing Electronic Health Records (EHR) case studies at any HBCU nationwide, integrate EHR and case studies in order to create unique ways to examine and inform the design of EHR technologies, and assess learning outcomes using these cases. One concern is inconsistency in the requested equipment. The proposal first indicates 15 computers are to be installed, then requests five Windows-based and 15 MacOS computers. Equipment is mainly for video and multimedia development. Later, the proposal indicates 10 computers are being requested, then on the following page there is a request for 10 Macs and 5 PCs. This is an interesting project. However, it appears to focus primarily on health sciences and education and does not collaborate meaningfully with the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12CIS-12

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement for Computer Science at Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Mislove

**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     7     (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 66 Points)

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

F.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

F. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
			\$122,241
	Recommended Amount:	\$0	\$0

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

The proposal requests funding for a new podium, projector, and server, access grid upgrades, support for students and guest speakers. This effort would augment institutional plans to re-establish the Computer Science (CS) Department. It is not clear if the University has committed to it or why this is needed given that the University has only just started first-year CS courses. It appears to be a waste of resources. The project has limited impact and does not strengthen the computing infrastructure. There is no funding from external agencies. The rationale needs stronger arguments. The statement on impact on existing resources and the budget justification are weak. The project director's knowledge of the CS discipline, curriculum, and equipment is limited. The economic and/or cultural development and impact sections are not convincing. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak. The goals and objectives are general. The proposal could be improved by defining specific measurable objectives or benchmarks to be accomplished and including a detailed description of how each objective will be evaluated. The proposal needs a stronger case for how this project will catapult the department into attaining a high level of eminence. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13CIS-12

INSTITUTION: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Tulane University-TULearn: An Online Learning Management System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Annie Daniel

**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)

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

G. Total Score: 

N/A
-----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$129,695  
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 supports the further development of "TULearn, a web-based content management system with educational features designed to organize content in ways that increase the efficiency and effectiveness of student and faculty workflow." The goal is to provide a curriculum delivery system for medical students. This does not appear to be a Computer Sciences curriculum or research-oriented project. It focuses primarily on the study of Health and Medical Sciences and does not appear to collaborate meaningfully with or enhance student learning in the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 14CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for New 3D Interaction Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christoph Borst

**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 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 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 15 (of 18 points)  
 B.3 12 (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 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$60,498</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal requests equipment and software to pursue new research directions and update computing power for visualization and 3D interaction projects. The project has limited impact. The enhancement plan seems appropriate but very general. It could use a clearer, stronger case for how the project will evaluate each objective in detail. The evidence provided for achieving eminence is weak. The economic and/or cultural development and impact sections could be stronger. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory for Research and Curriculum Development in  
Video Game Design and Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: James Etheredge

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$46,802</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$35,000</u>

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

The proposal seeks to acquire hardware and software to support curriculum development and research in video gaming. The equipment is needed to involve students in more in-depth research projects. The rationale and impact on existing resources are both clearly described and well supported. The requested equipment is justified. The enhancement plan is solid and presents in detail how the PIs will evaluate each objective. The project will enhance the students' opportunities for post-graduate work and quality employment. Although the evidence for achieving eminence is weak, a reasonably convincing argument can be made for recognition, job placement, and success in students going on to graduate school. There is no institutional match. Given the extremely limited resources available for 2012, reduced funding of \$35,000 is recommended. Reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 16CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory for Discrete Geometry in 3D Applications

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Miao Jin

**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)

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

G. Total Score: N/A (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$91,507</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The purpose of this project is to enhance infrastructure for the Applied Discrete Geometry Lab to build a bridge between geometry and broad engineering fields. This project does not collaborate meaningfully with or enhance student learning in the Computer and Information Sciences discipline. Therefore it cannot be rated and funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory for Intelligent Visual Surveillance and Tracking

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ashok Kumar

**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 0 (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 15 (of 18 points)  
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$59,513</u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal seeks to establish a wireless visual surveillance and tracking lab to support the PI's research. The project requests funds for equipment, software, supplies, and shipping. The requested software, as well as some of the supplies requested, should be available via normal departmental or University budgets. The rationale and impact on existing resources describe a very narrow and limited impact. The enhancement plan does not present a strong case for the suitability and quality of enhancements. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak. The enhancement plan of this proposal needs a much stronger case for how the project will directly impact and benefit Computer Science curriculum, instruction, and students. The justification for the equipment was not provided in the appropriate section of the proposal. The Panel does not recommend funding.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 18CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High-Performance Compute Cluster Enhanced with General Purpose GPU Parallelism

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Anthony Maida

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

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$128,397  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$128,397

(If additional monies become available)

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

This proposal requests GPGPUs (General Purpose Programming on a Graphics-Processing Unit), servers, storage, workstations, switches, and a power supply to enhance the infrastructure of the Biomorphic AI lab and Laboratory for Internet Computing. The facilities will support research and teaching in areas of AI pattern recognition, machine learning, visual analytics, and emerging trends in data-intensive applications, cognitive computing, high-performance GPGPU computing, and paradigms appropriate to clusters augmented with GPUs. The goals and objectives are clearly measurable. The performance measures and project rationale are both strong. The work plan with benchmarks is good. The requested equipment will complement existing resources. A stronger case for economic impact is needed. The enhancement plan of this proposal needs a more powerful argument for how the project will directly impact and benefit Computer Sciences curriculum, instruction, and students. A stronger case for eminence could be made. Full funding is recommended if additional monies become available.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 19CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: MASON Lab: A Laboratory for Mobile Ad-hoc Social Network  
Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hongyi Wu

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 6 (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 9 (of 18 points)  
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 5 (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$132,000  
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks to acquire equipment (\$117,000) and software (\$15,000) for establishing a Mobile Ad-hoc Social Network (MASON) Lab in support of the PIs' research and teaching. The rationale for the project needs stronger arguments. The narrative statement on impact on existing resources is weak. The enhancement plan does not present a strong case for how the project will evaluate each objective in detail. The goals are weak and too general. The evidence for achieving eminence is weak. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 20CIS-12

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: University of New Orleans: High-Performance Infrastructure for Information Assurance Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Vassil Roussev

## 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 14 (of 18 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

## D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

## F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 

87
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$174,400

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$75,000

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 project requests funds for equipment, software licenses and supplies to enhance the Information Assurance (IA) program. The improvements would enable cutting-edge lines of research and instruction in computer security, digital forensics, and cloud computing, and permit the faculty to significantly increase their research competitiveness, quality of curricular offerings, and teaching efforts. Clear and measurable goals, rather than activities, time frame and personnel, should have been identified for each objective. A reasonable argument can be made for regional eminence and strong national job placement, as well as an emerging national recognition in the field of information assurance. ABET accreditation is evidence of meeting nationally recognized quality program standards in computing. The attainment of the "Center for Academic Excellence in IA Education and Research" designation, one of only 36 universities to achieve this designation, is additional evidence of emerging national eminence. The PIs have established a solid research record. The project will enhance students' opportunities for post-graduate work and quality employment. There is no institutional match. Given the extremely limited resources in the 2012, reduced funding is recommended, with full funding recommended if additional monies become available. Reductions are to be made at the discretion of the PI.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Computer and Information Sciences  
for the FY 2011-12 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001CIS-12	Louis, Lynda	Dillard University	1	E	N	An Enhanced Learning Environment and Infrastructure for Computer Science Gateway Courses	\$105,341.00	\$0.00	\$105,341.00
002CIS-12	Herster, Margaret	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Digital Media Research and Development Studio	\$202,150.00	\$0.00	\$202,150.00
003CIS-12	Kooima, Robert	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	A 4K Stereoscopic LCD Wall for Education and Research	\$86,841.00	\$0.00	\$86,841.00
004CIS-12	Koppelman, David	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	A Cybersecurity Laboratory	\$66,750.00	\$0.00	\$66,750.00
005CIS-12	Peng, Lu	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1	E	N	A Solar Energy Supplied Computer Cluster for Research and Instruction	\$135,000.00	\$0.00	\$135,000.00
006CIS-12	Cvek, Urska	Louisiana State University in Shreveport	1	E	N	Immersive Learning Environment for Enrichment and Advancement of Instruction and Student Learning	\$95,889.00	\$0.00	\$95,889.00
007CIS-12	O'Neal, Mike	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Integrating Robotics into the Computer Science Curriculum	\$143,482.00	\$0.00	\$143,482.00
008CIS-12	Roberts, Tom	Louisiana Tech University	1	E	N	Smart Mobile Device Forensics Laboratory	\$118,208.00	\$0.00	\$118,208.00
009CIS-12	Bai, Shuju	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	2	E	N	Developing a High Performance Data Processing Laboratory	\$111,199.00	\$19,200.00	\$130,399.00
010CIS-12	Landor-Ngemi, Jarrett	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	1	E	N	Computer and Multimedia Technology for Educational Leaders	\$26,143.00	\$0.00	\$26,143.00
011CIS-12	Mbarika, Victor	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge	2	E	N	Southern University Health Information Technology Laboratory (SUHIT)	\$88,156.00	\$24,000.00	\$112,156.00
012CIS-12	Mislove, Michael	Tulane University	2	NE	N	Enhancement for Computer Science at Tulane University	\$122,241.00	\$49,400.00	\$171,641.00
013CIS-12	Daniel, Annie	Tulane University Health Sciences Center	1	E	N	Tulane University-TULearn: An Online Learning Management System	\$129,695.00	\$0.00	\$129,695.00

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/Non	New/Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
014CIS-12	Borst, Christoph	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Equipment for New 3D Interaction Research	\$60,498.00	\$0.00	\$60,498.00
015CIS-12	Etheredge, James	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Laboratory for Research and Curriculum Development in Video Game Design and Development	\$46,802.00	\$0.00	\$46,802.00
016CIS-12	Jin, Miao	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Laboratory for Discrete Geometry in 3D Applications	\$91,507.00	\$0.00	\$91,507.00
017CIS-12	Kumar, Ashok	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	Laboratory for Intelligent Visual Surveillance and Tracking	\$59,513.00	\$0.00	\$59,513.00
018CIS-12	Maida, Anthony	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	High-Performance Compute Cluster Enhanced with General Purpose GPU Parallelism	\$128,397.00	\$0.00	\$128,397.00
019CIS-12	Wu, Hongyi	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1	E	N	MASON Lab: A Laboratory for Mobile Ad-hoc Social Network Research and Education	\$132,000.00	\$0.00	\$132,000.00
020CIS-12	Roussev, Vassil	University of New Orleans	1	E	N	University of New Orleans: High-Performance Infrastructure for Information Assurance Research and Education	\$174,400.00	\$0.00	\$174,400.00

Total Number of Proposals submitted	20
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,124,212.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$92,600.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,216,812.00

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011-12  
 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: \_\_\_\_\_

Page 2 of 3

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: \_\_\_\_\_

Page 3 of 3

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_ of 100 points

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

COMMENTS:

---

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

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

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

(Form 6.11, rev 2011)

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

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

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011-12  
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS  
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 66 points**

- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.1      Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 23 pts.      B.2      Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 25 pts.      B.3      To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 pts.      B.4      To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 2 pts.      B.5      To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- \_\_\_\_\_ of 6 pts.      B.6      To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

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

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

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

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 2 of 3

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\_\_            E.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: \_\_\_\_\_