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INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett, University of Arizona, Chair; and Dr. Kevin Mickus, Missouri State University, communicated via phone and e-mail for the purpose of evaluating fifteen (15) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the conference: a) fifteen (15) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2012-13 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) the FY 2009-10 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the fifteen proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 82. 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.

For many proposals in Tables I and II, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations. The partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget, which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling $2,660,775 were submitted in Earth and Environmental Sciences. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling $649,380.
### TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>06EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$134,340</td>
<td>$122,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14EAR-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$259,275</td>
<td>$229,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>03EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$99,931</td>
<td>$96,531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>02EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$47,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>07EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$49,749</td>
<td>$48,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15EAR-13</td>
<td>UL-M</td>
<td>$92,610</td>
<td>$75,110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>01EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$278,505</td>
<td>$39,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$961,910</td>
<td>$649,380</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>09EAR-13</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$131,100</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>04EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$135,375</td>
<td>$134,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$266,475</td>
<td>$259,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13EAR-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$130,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12EAR-13</td>
<td>SU-BR</td>
<td>$122,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>08EAR-13</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>05EAR-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$96,369</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10EAR-13</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td>$300,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11EAR-13</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td>$677,223</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,432,390</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $961,910 $649,380 $0 $0

**TOTALS:** $266,475 $259,800 $0 $0

**TOTALS:** $1,432,390 $0 $0 $0
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01EAR-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Scanning Electron Microscope and a Cathodoluminescence Optical Microscope: Tools for Research and for Teaching Penetrative Thinking across Spatial Scales

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Barbara Dutrow

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)

B.2 12 (of 18 points)

B.3 19 (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

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)

C.2 1 (of 1 point)

C.3 3 (of 3 points)

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

D.1 12 (of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)

G. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $278,505

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $39,300

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

This proposal requests funds to replace an SEM and cathodoluminescence (CL) microscope in the Geology and Geophysics Department. The overused machines need to be replaced and new instruments would be used intensively by the faculty and students in their research. Of the two instruments, the CL scope is described as non-functional, while the SEM is described as working but hard to maintain. The PIs have an outstanding record of publications, and the lead PI is a national leader in mineralogical research. Maintenance and operation of the equipment will be conducted by an unspecified staff member. In a lean funding year, partial funding of $39,300 is recommended for the CL scope only. The panel suggests that the University consider covering the $500 software for the CL scope. The $15,000 equipment match can be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02EAR-13

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


PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chunyan Li

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)

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

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 9 (For S/E) or 1 (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

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

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: $47,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $38,000

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

This proposal requests funds to build a platform with a solar panel and instrumentation to determine bathymetry in coastal environments at the School of the Coast and Environment. Bathymetry data are often decades old and in need of updating for use in land reclamation or other restoration projects. In addition, pre- and post-storm measurements will be very valuable in assessing storm impact. The PI has an extensive research record that suggests the requested equipment would be used effectively. Impact on regional policy would be significant, and there is potential for direct use by commercial and/or governmental entities. The educational applications of the equipment are potentially significant, but are only described in general terms. The costs for installation (which appears to include technician salary) and truck rental are not explained well. The panel recommends partial funding of $38,000 with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The match, consisting only of indirect costs, may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03EAR-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an In Situ Microprofiler System for Environmental Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kanchan Maiti

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)

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 5 (of 5 points)
   B.5 2 (of 2 points)
   B.6 6 (of 6 points)
   B.7 Yes x No

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)
   C.1 5 (of 6 points)
   C.2 1 (of 1 point)
   C.3 2 (of 3 points)

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

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

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $99,931
Recommended Amount: $96,531

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 funds for an automated sediment profiler system in the Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences to measure chemical exchanges occurring near the sediment-water interface. The PIs will use the device as part of an established benthic sampler platform and in shallow wetlands. The potential for new research directions and associated external funding is high. The device will find immediate relevance to the processes taking place in hydrocarbon- or fertilizer-contaminated shallow waters. The PI and Co-PIs have strong research records in the chemistry of ocean sediments. The suggested applications to laboratory courses appear stimulating. Although the PIs could have made better presentations of equipment on hand, involvement of students in research, and the track record of the proposed equipment, this proposal is impressive. The panel recommends funding of $96,531 with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
This proposal requests funds for a new multichannel X-ray detector at CAMD. It would principally be used in X-ray absorption studies to identify and characterize contaminants. Measurements would be streamlined and the ability to detect and characterize speciation in low concentrations would be enhanced. Potential research applications to the PIs' programs are quite well described in principle, although more specific references to published work in the main text would have helped. The actual use of the requested equipment is not well described within the work plan. No description of how the instrument will be used in Earth and Environmental Sciences is provided. Educational applications are confined to moderate involvements of graduate students over time and a course planned by the lead PI. Industrial collaborations are developing. A quote from the manufacturer of the equipment should have been included. There is no institutional match. The panel recommends partial funding of $134,800, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI, if additional funds become available.
The proposal requests funds to establish an Earth Science (mostly meteorology) teaching laboratory in the Department of Geography and Anthropology. The requested resources would enhance the department’s ability to provide laboratory experiences for students that teach basic through advanced meteorological and hydrologic concepts. Most of the requested equipment items are computers, servers and licenses for software. The remaining equipment pieces, weather station and soil probes, will be used in lab exercises. The goals and objectives of the proposal are written in a very general way. In particular, the proposal only provides a simple list of the classes that would benefit from the equipment instead of details of the student exercises that would take place. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal requests funds to purchase and install a variety of items to enhance the visibility of geology at the Howe Russell Kniffen Museum Hall at LSU-Baton Rouge. The existing Earth Science exhibits are outdated. The proposed exhibits are well conceived in terms of content, location and variety. It is especially significant that the main parts of the exhibit will be located where general education students congregate for classes. The material requested will aid the Department of Geology and Geophysics and its students in presenting posters, showing visiting school groups and other outside people how geology is relevant and promoting geology as a profession. All of the requested items seem necessary, except for salary support. The University should help contribute to the in-house electrical installation. The panel recommends partial funding of $122,915 with no funding for salary support. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07EAR-13

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Acoustic and Optical Backscatter Sensors to Enhance the Research and Teaching of Sediment Dynamics at Louisiana State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kehui Xu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No</td>
<td>B.1 5 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 17 (of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 18 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)

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

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

| D.1 9 (of 12 points)                          |

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

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

F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)

| G.1 Yes x No                                  |

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $49,749

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $48,024

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 the Oceanography and Coastal Sciences Department to deploy sediment sensors predominantly in man-made diversion basins around the Mississippi Delta. The equipment has the potential to make a significant impact on the understanding of river manipulation and reclamation policies. The newly hired PI has a reasonable track record of shallow-water sediment observations and grants, though his peer-reviewed publications as presented do not seem prolific. Generally, the proposal is very clear and complete. The PI made a good case for the requested equipment by looking at all available models to determine the best for his needs. The projected impact on instruction appears valuable. In a lean budget year, the panel recommends partial funding of $48,024 with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match should be maintained in full.
### RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 08EAR-13

**INSTITUTION:** Nicholls State University  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Improvement of Environmental Research through the Acquisition of a Modern Gas Chromatograph/Mass Spectrometer  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Darcey Wayment

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A.1 Yes  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### B.2 11 (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)  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C.1 4 (of 6 points)  

#### C.2 1 (of 1 point)  

#### C.3 1 (of 3 points)  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D.1 10 (of 12 points)  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E.1 1 (of 2 points)  

#### E.2a 8 (For S/E)  

#### E.2b (For NS/NE)  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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:** $105,000  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** $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 to purchase a gas chromatograph/mass spectrometer system for the Departments of Physical Sciences and Biology. While the PIs are either chemists or biologists, they all conduct environment-related research to varying degrees. The need for characterization of organic compounds in the various research programs is demonstrated, although specifics as to what compounds will be targeted are generally lacking in the proposal. It does not appear that any of the PIs have direct experience with GC-MS, but collectively it is probable that they have sufficient experience to operate this new system. Training by the manufacturer, however, is not mentioned. Many chemistry and biology courses are listed as benefiting from the equipment, but it is not clear that it would or could be used in all of these. There is no quote from a manufacturer. The housing of the instrument is also undefined. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Heavy Metal Analytical Capability for Marine and Environmental Science Education and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Enmin Zou

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)

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

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 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 9 (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.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 RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $131,100
Recommended Amount: $125,000

(if additional funds become available)

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

The applicants request funds for an atomic absorption spectrometer and a mercury analyzer to monitor metals in coastal environments. The benefit of this research enhancement to established environmental programs would be considerable. There is an added degree of relevance following the recent major oil spill. Teaching is not emphasized strongly in the proposal, but there would be benefits in laboratory classes at the senior and graduate levels. The proposal would have been improved by a more thorough description of teaching applications. The performance measures are not specific. The panel recommends partial funding of $125,000 with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI if additional funds become available.
This proposal requests funding for a greenhouse and foundation to grow plants for wetland reclamation in collaboration with ongoing remediation efforts underway at Tulane University and elsewhere. Funds are also requested for lab and field equipment for environmental science work in coastal waters related to the reclamation. Potentially, the equipment would be useful in teaching students about environmental sciences and aid in studying a region with recent major hurricane damage. The main hardware items requested duplicate the other Nunez proposal in the competition (11EAR-13), as do the DVD and other software materials. For the most expensive item in the budget, the greenhouse and its foundation, only a general quote is given. Scant details are given of the role of student sampling and analysis, or the role that these activities would play in the overall mitigation project. Curricular developments are also only described in very general terms. Concerning the plants and the greenhouse, no information is given as to the numbers and the scale of growing and replanting. Firm indications of the areas to be targeted, their size, the number of plants to be transferred, and the potential impact of the whole effort would have helped the proposal. Performance measures are listed but are not sufficiently specific. The panel does not recommend funding.
This proposal requests funding to harvest and utilize runoff, construct a greenhouse to grow deep-rooted vegetation for use in wetland reclamation, and develop a related natural science curricula. Several of the main hardware items requested duplicate the other Nunez proposal in the competition (10EAR-13), as do the DVD and other software materials. Mitigating runoff is a worthy goal in a storm-prone neighborhood, but the small campus area from which runoff will be collected will have little regional impact. Growing deep-rooted vegetation for wetland reclamation seems worthwhile, but no details are given as to the quantity of plants that could be produced in the greenhouse with runoff utilization, or the areas, and the size of the areas, that would benefit from the replanting. No details of the proposed environmental science curriculum to be developed are given. Most of the budget is very detailed; however, the most expensive item, the rain collection system, is estimated to cost $300,000 without any price breakdown. The amount requested for shipping and handling is very high. Performance measures are listed, but are not sufficiently specific. The panel does not recommend funding.
INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of FT-Raman Capability in the Environmental Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Weihua Wang

A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 Yes 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 Yes 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)
B.1 Yes 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 Yes 12 (of 18 points)
B.3 Yes 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 Yes 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 Yes 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 Yes 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)
D.1 Yes 9 (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)
E.1 Yes 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a Yes 8 (For S/E) or 1 (For NS/NE) (of 10 points)
E.2b Yes 3 (For NS/NE)

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

YEAR 1 | YEAR 2
--- | ---
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: | Requested Amount: $122,649 | $0
Recommended | $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 proposal seeks to purchase a FT-Raman spectrometer for the Department of Chemistry & Environmental Toxicology. The need for the instrument in the research programs of the three PIs and one other faculty member is demonstrated. The utility of the instrument in laboratory courses is evident from the proposal. The weakness of the proposal, in the current competition, is the connection to environmental science. Of the four courses in which the instrument would be used, only one graduate class involves environmental toxicology. The main courses listed are part of a straightforward chemistry curriculum. Environmental science appears to be, at best, a secondary side of any of the PIs’ research. The institutional description details activities of and benefits to the College of Science, but not to Environmental Toxicology or any other environmental unit or activity. This proposal would find a much stronger home in the chemistry competition. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Applications of High Throughput Sequencing for the Environmental Research at UL Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Andrei Chistoserdov

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)
B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 18 points)
B.3 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 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)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)
D.1 11 (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 8 (For S/E)
or __________ (of 10 points)
E.2b __________ (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes x No __________

G. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $130,500
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

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

This proposal requests funds for a second-generation DNA sequencer in the Biology Department. The new sequencing equipment is needed to rapidly generate modern high-volume datasets so that the faculty will maintain competitiveness in research. Plans for use of this equipment in courses are only described in very general terms. The benefits of the equipment to graduate students and their projects are not outlined. In the context of the Earth and Environmental Sciences competition, some details of environmental courses where this equipment would be used and of environmental graduate student projects would have greatly helped the proposal. No manufacturer quotation is presented. The proposal would be stronger in the biology competition. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Cutting-edge Instrumentation to Support a Shale Gas/Oil Educational and Research Initiative at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Lock

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 10 (of 12 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)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
G.1 Yes NA 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: $259,275
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $229,500

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

This proposal seeks funding for an organic rock analysis machine in the School of Geosciences to assist in research programs involving shale oil/gas resources, and to train students in such evaluations. The research and the proposed facility seem timely in both national- and state-level resource developments. The University is strongly tied to the local petroleum industry and is trying to increase its presence in the current rush for shale gas exploration. The requested instrument would clearly aid in this regard and would be used in numerous courses. However, its use in student research is not clearly defined and no definite projects have been discussed. The PIs clearly cover most aspects of geochemistry, but their research records in organic geochemistry, particularly the lead PI, appear thin. However, the prospect for projects is strong, especially given the collaboration with local petroleum companies, indicating that the instrument would be useful in student research and has the potential to bring in additional research dollars. While there are no matching funds detailed, one PI (Schubert) will be granted a year of teaching release to develop the laboratory. In a lean funding year the panel recommends funding of $229,500 with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Research and Education through Observation-model Comparisons of Rainfall Microphysics and Structures

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Hopper

A. The Current Situation
   (Total of 10 Points)
   A.1 Yes □ No □
   A.2 □ 5 (of 5 points)
   A.3 □ 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
   (Total of 56 Points)
   B.1 □ 4 (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 □ 5 (of 6 points)
   B.7 Yes □ No □

C. Equipment
   (Total of 10 Points)
   C.1 □ 5 (of 6 points)
   C.2 □ 1 (of 1 point)
   C.3 □ 3 (of 3 points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
   (Total of 12 Points)
   E.1 □ 2 (of 2 points)
   E.2a □ 8 (For S/E)
   or □ (of 10 points)
   E.2b □ (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
   (No Points Assigned)
   G.1 Yes □ NA □ 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: $92,610
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $75,110

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 for the Department of Atmospheric Sciences to be used in measuring rain drop size, winds and rainfall totals in Northeast Louisiana, and to predict storm dynamics and flash flooding. This well-written proposal is from young, newly hired investigators who are well established, as judged by publications in top journals. The proposed techniques would be a new application to this region. ULM's atmospheric program is entirely undergraduate and the requested equipment would enhance the curricula through student research activities. The equipment will be integrated into course instruction, though that area could have been better described in the proposal. The installation of the equipment and the continued research is well planned, with pro-bono involvement of the lead PI's former advisor. The match by the University is good. In a lean budget year, the panel believes that a significant enhancement would be delivered by funding the instruments only. Partial funding of $75,110 is recommended. The institutional match should be maintained in full.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
## Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Earth/Environmental Sciences for the FY 2012-13 Review Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Equipment/ Non Equipment</th>
<th>New/ Continuation</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001EAR-13</td>
<td>Dutrow, Barbara</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Acquisition of a Scanning Electron Microscope and a Cathodoluminescence Optical Microscope: Tools for research and for teaching penetrative thinking across spatial scales</td>
<td>$278,505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002EAR-13</td>
<td>Li, Chunyan</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancement of Research and Education: Solar Powered Automated Observing Platform [SPAOP] for Met-OceanData and Bathymetry Measurements</td>
<td>$47,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003EAR-13</td>
<td>Maiti, Kanchan</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>ACQUISITION OF AN IN SITU MICROPROFILER SYSTEM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION</td>
<td>$99,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004EAR-13</td>
<td>Roy, Amitava</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Multi-Element Silicon Drift Detector for X-Ray Absorption Spectroscopy</td>
<td>$135,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005EAR-13</td>
<td>Trepanier, Jill</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Bringing the Environment Inside: An Earth Sciences Laboratory</td>
<td>$96,369.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006EAR-13</td>
<td>Wanny, Sophie</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Four exciting infrastructure improvements to the Howe Russell Kniffen Geoscience Museum Hall to enhance research training, education and recruitment in the Earth Sciences</td>
<td>$134,340.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007EAR-13</td>
<td>Xu, Kehui</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Acquisition of Acoustic and Optical Backscatter Sensors to Enhance the Research and Teaching of Sediment Dynamics at Louisiana State University</td>
<td>$49,749.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008EAR-13</td>
<td>Wayment, Darcey</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Improvement of Environmental Research through the Acquisition of a Modern Gas Chromatograph / Mass Spectrometer</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009EAR-13</td>
<td>Zou, Enmin</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancing heavy metal analytical capability for marine and environmental science education and research</td>
<td>$131,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010EAR-13</td>
<td>Waddell, Stephen</td>
<td>Nunez Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancements to Reclaim the Wetlands</td>
<td>$300,649.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011EAR-13</td>
<td>Waddell, Stephen</td>
<td>Nunez Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Sustainable Water Management</td>
<td>$677,223.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Number</td>
<td>PI Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Equipment/ Non Equipment</td>
<td>New/ Continuation</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012EAR-13</td>
<td>Wang, Weihua</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancement of FT-Raman Capability in the Environmental Sciences for Research and Teaching at Southern University</td>
<td>$122,649.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$122,649.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013EAR-13</td>
<td>Chistoserdov, Andrei</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Applications of high throughput sequencing for the environmental research at UL Lafayette.</td>
<td>$130,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$130,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014EAR-13</td>
<td>Lock, Brian</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Cutting-edge instrumentation to support a shale gas/oil educational and research initiative at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>$259,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$259,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015EAR-13</td>
<td>Hopper, Larry</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Integrating research and education through observation-model comparisons of rainfall microphysics and structures</td>
<td>$92,610.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$92,610.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| Number of Proposals Submitted | 15 |
| Total Money Requested for First Year | $2,660,775.00 |
| Total Money Requested for Second Year | $0.00 |
| Total Money Requested | $2,660,775.00 |
Appendix B

Rating Forms
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?
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:
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 2012)
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 personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?
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
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:________________________________________
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