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Introduction

Fifteen (15) Multidisciplinary Enhancement Program proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents staff for review by the panel chair, Dr. Jeffrey Dean of the University of Georgia. The proposals were divided into the root disciplines eligible for this year’s competition, including Arts, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Health and Medical Sciences, and Engineering A, and distributed to five subject-area reviewers. No proposals were submitted in the root discipline of Agricultural Sciences. The total funding requested in first-year funds was $1,549,540.

Dr. Dean received the following materials for review: (a) the fifteen (15) proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, etc.; (c) the FY 2012-13 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program Request for Proposals (RFP); and (d) fifteen (15) rating forms.

The subject-area reviewers submitted their evaluations of individual proposals by February 21, 2013 electronically to Dr. Dean for further review. After careful consideration and communication with subject-area reviewers, the proposals were ranked and $727,689 was recommended to fund seven (7) proposals, one (1) of them at a reduced level. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding should funds become available. Table III contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding.

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.
MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT, FY 2012-13

SUBJECT-AREA REVIEWERS

Ms. Virginia Rougon Chavis, University of Mississippi   Arts (Graphic Design)
Dr. Robert Thompson, Georgia State University   Arts (Music)
Dr. Jonathan Patchett, University of Arizona   Earth and Environmental Sciences
Dr. Richard Seagrave, Iowa State University   Engineering A
Dr. Thomas Robinson, University of Kentucky   Health and Medical Sciences
### 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>97</td>
<td>05MUL-13</td>
<td>McNeese</td>
<td>$95,086</td>
<td>$95,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>07MUL-13</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$105,272</td>
<td>$105,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>15MUL-13</td>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13MUL-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$76,325</td>
<td>$76,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14MUL-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$101,455</td>
<td>$101,455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>03MUL-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$107,718</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12MUL-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$149,551</td>
<td>$149,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $760,407 $727,689 $0 $0

### 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>84</td>
<td>01MUL-13</td>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td>$121,148</td>
<td>$106,006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>04MUL-13</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$90,692</td>
<td>$90,692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>09MUL-13</td>
<td>SU-BR</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $312,340 $297,198 $0 $0

### 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>11</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11MUL-13</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$91,565</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>08MUL-13</td>
<td>SLU</td>
<td>$164,991</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,580</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10MUL-13</td>
<td>SU-NO</td>
<td>$92,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>02MUL-13</td>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td>$94,785</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>06MUL-13</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$33,252</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,580</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $476,793 $0 $8,580 $0
INSTITUTION: Dillard University

ROOT DISCIPLINE: Health and Medical

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Qualitative Research and Learning Laboratory (QURALL)

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Charlotte Hurst

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (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

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 12 (of 12 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
E.2b (For NS/NE)
E.2b (of 10 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: $121,148
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $106,006

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

This proposal from the School of Nursing seeks to establish a learning laboratory for faculty and students to enhance qualitative research capabilities and instruction. The authors do not clearly define "qualitative research" and there are no research projects suggested in the narrative. The lab appears to be principally for assisting students in computer instruction and with research and analysis. There currently is nothing like this lab at the institution. The authors note that the lab would help develop the required Quality Enhancement Plan for the Southern Association of College and Schools. The goals and objectives are clear and well written. The laboratory would serve students in Nursing, Public Health, Sociology, Social Work, and Biology. The rationale lacks specifics, only pointing to a greater assurance of enhancing qualitative research and allowing students to become more technologically prepared. The work plan is well done with deadlines and measurables congruent with the goals and objectives. The section on eminence is weak. The proposal could be greatly improved by demonstrating a clear linkage of the lab to potential student improvement. The proposal adequately addresses the curricula and the well-qualified faculty. The need for the equipment is documented and housing and maintenance plans are provided. The impact on economic development is not addressed. There is no institutional match. Partial funding of $106,006 is recommended if funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.
The proposal seeks to establish a multidisciplinary lab to enhance music and theatre education. Providing a means for students to explore computer-aided composition and sound design is a laudable idea. However, the goals are vague and the multidisciplinary relationships are not fully articulated. The specific benefits for theatre students are not well defined. It is not clear if fundamental equipment is on hand such as microphones, signal processors and multi-channel speaker systems. A Steinway piano is requested that, at $40,000, represents half the budget, yet the narrative does not clearly describe how it fits into teaching and learning sound design in a laboratory setting. A Yamaha Motif keyboard is requested as a teaching station but not incorporated as a useful learning tool. The software components are good ones, but the software request overall could have been streamlined with packages that maximize the educational potential of the lab. The project represents an excellent idea, and it is suggested that the proposal be reworked with to include more details related to both the pedagogical potential of the lab and the technical resources that exist. Funding is not recommended.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 03MUL-13  
**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College - Baton Rouge  
**ROOT DISCIPLINE:** Arts  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Mobile Media User eXperience (MMUX) Research Enhancement Grant  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Jesse Allison

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>(of 5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>(of 6 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| D.1 | 8   | (of 12 points) |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>(of 2 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

G.1 Yes | No | x

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

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**  
**Requested Amount:** $107,718

**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 proposal requests support for enhancing research and activities in mobile computing across several disciplines. It is well-written, well-researched and truly multidisciplinary, involving computer science, engineering, arts and humanities. The curricular impact is clear. Graduating students will be more competitive in the job market and faculty research will be enhanced. The visual arts component of the proposal, a crucial aspect of mobile computing, was underdeveloped and, as a result, the proposal seems more firmly rooted in computer sciences than arts. Including faculty from the School of Design would improve this aspect of the project. Partial funding of $75,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match, which consists solely of indirect costs, may be reduced proportionately.
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Baton Rouge

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Compositing Facilities: Micro-Rheology Compounder

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kerry Dooley

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 15 (of 18 points)
   B.3 15 (of 20 points)
   B.4 3 (of 5 points)
   B.5 1 (of 2 points)
   B.6 4 (of 6 points)
   B.7 Yes [x] No

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

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

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $90,692
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $90,692

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

This is a well-written proposal to support the acquisition of a very specialized device with modest interdisciplinary impact. The proposed equipment would expand an existing, well-recognized research capability, and would have a minor impact on undergraduate and graduate education. The PI and other faculty and staff for the project are well qualified. The work plan could be more specific and is dependent on new projects not yet developed. It is recommended that this proposal be supported in full if additional funds become available.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05MUL-13
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Engineering A

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Data Acquisition and Signal Processing Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Zhuang 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 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 6 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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

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

G. Total Score: 97 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $95,086
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $95,086

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

This is a well-presented proposal that seeks to provide significant upgrading of important core courses in several engineering departments by developing resources for data acquisition and signal processing. The authors make a strong case for enhancing undergraduate education. The work plan is very good, and the equipment acquisition proposed is tied exceptionally well to the goals and objectives. The proposed equipment will leverage an in-kind donation of specialized equipment from a regional company, which should serve to strengthen an important strategic partnership. The faculty members and the PIs are well qualified to carry out the proposed activities. This is an excellent proposal deserving of full funding.
**Title of Proposal:** Farm to Table: Growing a Sustainable Community

**Principal Investigator:** Monica Larousse

### A. The Current Situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 10 Points)

### B. The Enhancement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 56 Points)

### C. Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.1</th>
<th></th>
<th>(of 6 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 10 Points)

### D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

| D.1 |      | (of 12 points) |

(Total of 12 Points)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.1</th>
<th></th>
<th>(of 2 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 12 Points)

### F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

| G.1 | Yes | No |

### G. Total Score: NR (of 100 points)

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

**Specific Budgetary Requested Amount:** $33,252

**Recommended Amount:** $0

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

The proposal seeks to establish an organic garden to be used as a learning tool in Culinary Arts classes as well as some biology classes. It is a creative project that would provide a unique enhancement, but it does not appear to be eligible for this competition. Based on the taxonomy listed in the RFP, it appears to best fit under Social Sciences via the sub-discipline of Consumer Economics, with a minor Biological Sciences component. Because those disciplines are not eligible in this cycle, the proposal could not be rated. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal seeks to acquire an ion chromatography system for teaching and research in biological and physical sciences. It is truly interdisciplinary, benefiting study in biology and chemistry, but rooted in earth and environmental sciences with student research involving marine and other aquatic sampling and analysis on the Louisiana coast. The project will enhance environmental research, for which the institution has developed a recognized regional strength. The PIs are very qualified to operate the system. There is a solid educational component with impact on several classes detailed. The proposal has been moderately revised from a high-scoring submission in 2011-12, and budget recommendations from the previous review (such as a request for departments to provide supplies) have been followed closely. Full funding is recommended.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 08MUL-13

**INSTITUTION:** Southeastern Louisiana University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** eLearning Together: Collaboration in Health Sciences to Promote Campus Health

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Ann Carruth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>A. The Current Situation</strong></th>
<th><strong>B. The Enhancement Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 66 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 x</td>
<td>B.1 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 18 (of 23 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 2 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 18 (of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.5 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6 4 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>B.7 Yes No x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise</strong></th>
<th><strong>D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 9 (of 12 points)</td>
<td>D.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.2a 7 (For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>D.2b (For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</strong></th>
<th><strong>E. Previous Support Fund Awards</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(No Points Assigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>F.1 Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2a 7 (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2b (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)**

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

**YEAR 1** | **YEAR 2**
---|---
**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** | **Requested** | **Amount:** | **Recommended** | **Amount:**
RECOMMENDATIONS: | $164,991 | $8,580 |
**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.)

The College of Nursing and Health Sciences seeks to train students for competence in yet-to-be-defined interprofessional themes. Students will be trained to be part of an integrated student team in a wellness program for University employees. Credible sources are cited describing the need for this type of educational experience. The narrative focuses not on the requested video equipment but on using a community health system for student clinical experiences. The request is almost entirely for equipment, though it was submitted as non-equipment proposal. The project would enhance the College’s audio-visual infrastructure, yet the authors fail to connect the budget request to the goals and objectives or make the case that the equipment is necessary to develop interprofessional education. The use of video technology to implement this program is innovative but is not addressed in the body of the proposal, only in the budget justification. The training for interprofessional education will enhance the quality of the curricula and will positively affect the program’s ability to recruit and retain quality students. The faculty is well qualified to develop the themes and curricula. The cultural and economic impact is demonstrated and community relationships are cited that will help ensure good training. The institutional match is impressive, as is the percentage of faculty time assigned for project development. However, as written the proposal is not compelling or well justified and funding is not recommended.
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Enhancement of Characterization Capability for Next Generation Composite CREST Center at Southern University – Baton Rouge

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Yoonyoung Jin

**A. The Current Situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>(of 5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Equipment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>(of 6 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

| D.1 | 9   | (of 12 points) |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>(of 2 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

| F.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 RECOMMENDATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Amount:</th>
<th>$100,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Amount:</td>
<td>$100,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is a truly interdisciplinary proposal to acquire an important piece of equipment that would benefit several academic departments in education and research. The stated goals and objectives, however, do not appear to be directly connected to the equipment requested; conversely, the work plan centers only on the acquisition and installation of the scanning electron microscope requested. The impact on current and future research projects, along with the description of the equipment itself, are well presented. The faculty involved in the project have the required expertise. There is not a strong case made for resulting economic development. However, the request represents a worthy investment and full funding is recommended if additional funds become available.
The proposal seeks to develop pedagogical tools for curricular enhancements in arts and for the prevention of drug use among youth. While it is a worthy project, it does not appear to be firmly rooted in the arts. The overall goal is to prevent drug use by getting young children and adolescents interested in positive influences. This project is in the developmental stage and it would be helpful to have more specific goals. Once suggestion is that the project place emphasis in drawing or 2-D design instead of a variety of mediums. It also seems this may be a program that would fit well with art education or even the humanities. A convincing argument is not made for impact on faculty development. The requested color printer/plotter and copier are expensive for this type of project. The budget as a whole could be much more efficient. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Visualization Environments for Curriculum Enhancement in Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christoph Borst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 62 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No</td>
<td>B.1 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 17 (of 23 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 20 (of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 5 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6 6 (of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise</td>
<td>B.7 Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 10 (of 12 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</th>
<th>E. Previous Support Fund Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(No Points Assigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>F.1 Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or D.2a 8 (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or D.2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For NS/NE) (of 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points) |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $91,565
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

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

The proposal seeks curricular development through the application of the existing, excellent computational infrastructure at ULL to two engineering departments by developing improved software at the departmental level. However, the stated goals and objectives are very broad, and the proposed work plan is not specific. A strong case is not made for how obtaining a new workstation, providing additional support for graduate students, and adding a research associate would help to achieve the suggested goals. The bulk of the request is to support personnel. For this proposal to be competitive, it needs to make a stronger and much more specific case for the equipment. No funding is recommended.
This straightforward and well-written proposal seeks to acquire testing equipment to support improved materials science research and teaching capability in three engineering departments. It is multidisciplinary in that the direct beneficiaries will be the Departments of Civil and Chemical Engineering under the currently eligible discipline of Engineering A, as well as the Department of Mechanical Engineering under Engineering B. The goals and objectives are modest but well presented. The expertise of participating faculty and the principal investigator is very high. The workplan is solid, and the supporting information for equipment selection is well presented. The connection to existing research projects and to instruction is clear. Full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 13MUL-13
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Arts

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Fabrication Teaching Laboratory: Essential Upgrades

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Corey Saft

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 16 (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 10 (of 12 points)

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

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

G. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $76,325
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $76,325

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.)

Funding is requested to support the development of a digital fabrication teaching laboratory. The request is an interesting one and will help students to be more prepared professionally for a competitive field. Participants include multiple departments within the School of Architecture & Design, the School of Music and Performing Arts, and the Department of Visual Arts. The facility upgrade appears to be a natural step towards improving the quality of the student experience and the ability of the various departments to remain competitive. The project will enhance University eminence, benefit faculty research and aid in accreditation. It is difficult for faculty to become recognized on a national level with outdated equipment, such as computers that require software that is no longer manufactured. The requested router is expensive, but appears necessary. The proposal is well-written, well-supported and thoughtful. Full funding is recommended.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of a Coastal Wetland Laboratory to Enhance Multidisciplinary Education and Research

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jenneke Visser

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 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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 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 N/A 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: $101,455
RECOMMENDED: $101,455

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 develop eight wetland ponds in an existing facility where basins are available but no longer used. Equipment is requested to seal, pump, colonize and maintain six environments of differing salinity and to promote ecological and other wetland research and teaching. The remaining two basins will be used for simulated tidal movements in and out of the six active research areas. The proposal is truly interdisciplinary, with benefit to the Departments of Geosciences, Engineering, and Biology. The PIs, with specialties in aquatic ecology, engineering and geochemistry, are well-qualified, active researchers with significant funding and publications. The potential for enhanced interdisciplinary research with the new facility is high. The potential for enhancement of several laboratory classes is also high, though largely generic outlines of activities are listed for each course. Full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15MUL-13
ROOT DISCIPLINE: Engineering A

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a He Recovery and Liquefaction System for the Existing PPMS for Characterization of Electrical and Electronic Devices

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Leonard Spinu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 56 Points)</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4  5    (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5  2    (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6  6    (of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7  Yes  x  No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Equipment</th>
<th>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1  6    (of 6 points)</td>
<td>D.1  11  (of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2  1    (of 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3  3    (of 3 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E. Economic and/or Cultural      | F. Previous Support Fund Awards |
| Development and Impact           | (No Points Assigned)            |
| (Total of 12 Points)             | G.1  Yes  x  No                  |
| E.1  2    (of 2 points)          |                                  |
| E.2a  9  (For S/E)               |                                  |
| or (of 10 points)                |                                  |
| E.2b  (For NS/NE)                |                                  |

| G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points) |                          |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $125,000
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $125,000

COMMENTS: This well-written proposal makes a strong case to acquire a helium recondenser needed to support improved research and teaching in three academic departments. Procurement of this equipment will address rapidly increasing costs for liquid helium that are leading to significant downtime of an important shared equipment resource. The goals and objectives, the work plan, and the faculty expertise are outstanding. The research programs that will benefit are highly regarded, and the improvement resulting from the expanded infrastructure provided by a helium recovery and liquefaction system represents an excellent investment. This proposal is highly recommended for full funding.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<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>001MULTI-13</td>
<td>Hurst, Charlotte</td>
<td>Dillard University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Qualitative Research and Learning Laboratory (QURALL)</td>
<td>$121,148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002MULTI-13</td>
<td>Zidaru, Lucian</td>
<td>Dillard University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Laboratory of Music Composition and Sound Design (ILMCS)</td>
<td>$94,785.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003MULTI-13</td>
<td>Allison, Jesse</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mobile Media User eXperience (MMUX) Research Enhancement Grant</td>
<td>$107,718.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004MULTI-13</td>
<td>Dooley, Kerry</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 Compositing Facilities: Micro-Rheology Compounder</td>
<td>$90,692.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005MULTI-13</td>
<td>Li, Zhuang</td>
<td>McNeese State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancement of Data Acquisition and Signal Processing Laboratory</td>
<td>$95,086.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006MULTI-13</td>
<td>LAROUSSE, MONICA</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Farm to Table: Growing a Sustainable Community</td>
<td>$33,252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007MULTI-13</td>
<td>Melancon, Earl</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Application of a Dual-Capillary Ion Chromatography System in Marine and Environmental Science Research and Education</td>
<td>$105,272.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008MULTI-13</td>
<td>Carruth, Ann</td>
<td>Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>eLearning Together: Collaboration in Health Sciences to Promote Campus Health</td>
<td>$164,991.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009MULTI-13</td>
<td>Jin, Yoonyoung</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Enhancement of Characterization Capability for Next Generation Composite CREST Center at Southern University – Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$100,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010MULTI-13</td>
<td>Ramirez, Cynthia</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at New Orleans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Developing Arts Pedagogical Tools for Curricula Enhancements Across Campus and for the Prevention of Drug Use Among Youth</td>
<td>$92,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011MULTI-13</td>
<td>Borst, Christoph</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Visualization Environments for Curriculum Enhancement in Civil Engineering and Earth Sciences</td>
<td>$91,565.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012MULTI-13</td>
<td>Misra, R. Devesh</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Multipurpose fatigue system to integrate with teaching and research of multidisciplinary subject: Mechanics of Materials</td>
<td>$149,551.00</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>013MULTI-13</td>
<td>Saft, Corey</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Digital Fabrication Teaching Laboratory: Essential Upgrades</td>
<td>$76,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014MULTI-13</td>
<td>Visser, Jenneke</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Development of a Coastal Wetland Laboratory to Enhance Multi-disciplinary Education and Research</td>
<td>$101,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015MULTI-13</td>
<td>Spinu, Leonard</td>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Acquisition of a He Recovery and Liquefaction System for the Existing PPMS for Characterization of Electrical and Electronic Devices</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Proposals submitted</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested for First Year</td>
<td>$1,549,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested for Second Year</td>
<td>$8,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested</td>
<td>$1,558,120.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Rating Forms
### A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of 5 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of 5 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

### B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 56 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.1</th>
<th>Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 5 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.2</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 18 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.3</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 20 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.4</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 5 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.5</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 2 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.6</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of 6 pts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Points Given, but this is a required component.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.7</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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:
A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)? |
|     | _____ | 5 pts. |

|     | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)? |
|     | _____ | 5 pts. |

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 66 points

|     | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
|     | _____ | 5 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? |
|     | _____ | 23 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? |
|     | _____ | 25 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? |
|     | _____ | 5 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? |
|     | _____ | 2 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? |
|     | _____ | 6 pts. |

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

|     | 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? |
|     | _____ | 12 pts |
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?

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?

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: ______________________

(Form 6.12, rev.2012)