

**Report of Final Panel
Board of Regents Support Fund
Enhancement Component FY 2006-07**

Arts

The Review Panel for Enhancement Proposals in the Arts consisted of the chair, Dr. Lynn Wood Bertrand (Music) from Emory University, Dr. Beti Ellerson (Art) from Denison University, and Dr. Albert D. Tucci (Theater Arts) from the University of Arizona. All three members of the panel were recruited from outside Louisiana in keeping with the dictates of the Louisiana Board of Regents Support Fund, and every effort was made to constitute the committee from diverse disciplines within the arts. The three panel members received the packet of twenty-three proposals in ample time to review the materials before arrival in Baton Rouge. Additionally, the members of the panel provided other panel members with breakdowns of requests by discipline and institution and requested that each reviewer provide a preliminary ranking of the proposals before the panel convened. For three days, March 8-10, 2007, the panel met to discuss the merits of each proposal in detail.

Initial discussion centered around the evaluation criteria, the different types of proposals submitted for review, the relative appropriateness of each type with regard to the criteria set forth by the Board of Regents Support Fund guidelines, and the natural division of the proposals into the arts sub-disciplines of Visual Arts, Music, Theater and Film, and those proposals that appeared to be interdisciplinary or to cross sub-disciplinary lines within the arts. Thirteen institutions submitted proposals for this rotation of Arts funding, which was considered to be a good representation of the Louisiana schools eligible for funds. While each proposal had great worth relative to the mission and objectives of its home institution the panel found that those proposals concerned with a cross-section of student populations in the arts disciplines were particularly compelling. The funds available for fiscal year 2006-07, however, would allow support of only approximately forty-one percent of the total amount of money requested. Requests ranged from \$27,900 to \$243,000.

Following initial discussion and examination of proposals and criteria, each proposal was placed into one of three categories: proposals recommended for funding, proposals recommended for funding if additional funds should become available, and proposals not recommended for funding. (See Tables I, II, and III, respectively.) Further discussion of proposals in the first and second category led to a final ranking. The panel awarded \$982,990 to proposals listed in Table I and \$888,484 if additional funds become available to proposals listed in Table II. Should more money become available, the panel wholeheartedly recommends that, to the extent possible, all proposals in Table II be funded in rank order at the levels recommended. Appendix A consists of a list of proposals submitted in this year's Arts competition, and Appendix B contains sample evaluation forms.

Although the reviewers attempted to consider the different missions and objectives of the institutions submitting proposals, a proposal that did not, in spirit, meet the overall criteria for “enhancement” and was only concerned with equipment purchase or equipment replacement was not recommended. Some proposals not recommended for funding or recommended for reduced funding were those that requested exceedingly high levels of funding, which, if supported, would have precluded consideration of other meritorious requests at substantially lower funding levels. Others requested funding for what the panel considered to be basic renovation, basic installation of equipment, or basic materials that ought rightly to be the responsibility of the sponsoring institution. Some proposals, additionally, did not list meaningful matching support as a means of demonstrating that the proposal was an institutional priority. In a few cases a single institution submitted as many as four proposals. Although the panel members could see that there had been an attempt not to duplicate equipment requests from proposal to proposal, it was difficult to ascertain exactly which proposals represented institutional priorities.

With few exceptions the proposals were well written and worthy of consideration. Only a few, however, exhibited the creative spark that made them compelling to the readers. All proposals recommended for funding met the overall “enhancement” criteria and state-of-the-art approaches to the creative process and will allow investigators and students to function in a high-level, generative manner. Proposals that were concerned *solely* with acquiring materials and equipment, or that did not contribute to an innovative approach to learning in the arts, often scored low compared to those that demonstrated imagination and concern for the creative process, and an innovative approach to curricular reform. Hence, technology-based proposals tended at times to receive lower ratings in the following categories:

b.1 – “Measurable objectives to accomplish the project goals.” While many of the proposals did very well in articulating the goals of the project, there was a repetition and even overstatement of what would actually be accomplished.

b.2 – “Evidence of potential to achieve recognized eminence.” Many of the proposals gave a similar rationale for requesting technological upgrading, “to be competitive” and “to produce top-quality students who are able to attain technological excellence.” Again, there was no distinction.

e.1 – “Promotion of economic development and/or cultural resources.” There was a tendency to overemphasize the significance of acquiring skills in new technologies and its impact on marketability in the increasingly computer technology-driven industries where students will seek jobs.

The arts review panel made several observations that might be of assistance for future applicants: (1) if an institution is supporting multiple proposals from a single department or division, a listing of institutional priority would be of great use to the committee; (2) institutions and investigators are encouraged to prioritize requests with regard to components, with a clear indication and description of pieces of equipment that are intended to work in concert with one another; (3) if pieces of equipment requested are dependent upon other pieces of equipment to operate, a clear statement that describes the operation of such equipment and whether it is usable alone should be provided; and (4)

all principal investigators submitting proposals should be encouraged to aggressively seek external support and detail such in the proposal. While the evaluators acknowledge that grants such as those given here are likely to generate outside support after the grant period expires, a concerted effort should be made to have outside support committed before the proposal is submitted. Many of the proposals submitted in this round of funding have clear potential in this area.

Overall, the proposals were prepared well and it is the sincere belief of the evaluators that more are worthy of funding than there are funds available. The arts panel would also like to commend the institutions of Louisiana for very creative use of arts funding in a distressing economic environment.

Suggestions to the Board of Regents

- Given the lack of increased funding in the Arts enhancement pool over the last fifteen years, the evaluators suggest that a funding cap of no more than \$150,000 be placed on single-discipline proposals.
- In light of the high cost of advanced technology, an integral part of higher education, the evaluators suggest that the Board of Regents specify the difference between equipment upgrade and enhancement.
- The evaluators suggest that arts grants submitted by the same department or institution be given a priority ranking by either the department chair or other university official.
- The evaluators suggest that Section F of the rating form be revised to include the amount of matching funds by both dollar amount and by in-kind support. This would be of great value in scoring Section F.
- The instructions to the grant writer ought to suggest prioritization of the components of the request and ask that they be presented in priority order. This prioritized order is especially important when large sums of money are requested for equipment that is dependent upon other pieces of equipment for operation. This prioritization would help evaluators support worthy projects for which total funding is not available.
- The evaluators suggest that a schedule for equipment maintenance and replacement be part of all equipment requests and articulate how the institution will take budgetary responsibility for this task.
- The evaluators suggest that the narrative statement be reduced to no more than ten pages. This is in order to reduce the amount of reiteration in the proposals.

Commendations and Comments

- The evaluators very much appreciate and commend the professionalism of the staff and the Board of Regents liaison to the Arts Panel, Bryan Jones.
- The evaluators would like to thank everyone involved with the organization of materials before and during the visit; things went very smoothly and were well organized.
- The Arts Panel would like to express its appreciation for the hospitality shown during their visit to Baton Rouge.

TABLE I

Proposals Highly Recommended for Funding					
Rank	Number	Institution	Request	Award	Rating
1	003-ART-07	Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge	\$142,143	\$130,693	98
2	020-ART-07	University of Louisiana-Lafayette	\$41,670	\$41,670	96
3	006-ART-07	Louisiana Tech University	\$91,159	\$82,659	94
4	009-ART-07	Louisiana Tech University	\$53,153	\$53,153	93
5	014-ART-07	Northwestern State University	\$227,566	\$182,838	91
6	022-ART-07	University of Louisiana-Lafayette	\$114,099	\$93,832	90
7	007-ART-07	Louisiana Tech University	\$51,636	\$51,636	89
8	021-ART-07	University of Louisiana-Lafayette	\$96,480	\$87,880	87
9	011-ART-07	Loyola University New Orleans	\$160,010	\$155,502	86
10	010-ART-07	Loyola University New Orleans	\$71,507	\$62,127	85
11	008-ART-07	Louisiana Tech University	\$67,933	\$41,000	84
			\$1,117,356	\$982,990	

TABLE II

Proposals Recommended for Funding if Funds Become Available					
Rank	Number	Institution	Request	Award	Rating
12	002-ART-07	Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge	\$148,527	\$148,527	83
13	019-ART-07	University of Louisiana-Lafayette	\$145,706	\$145,706	82
14	012-ART-07	McNeese State University	\$85,570	\$85,570	81
15	004-ART-07	Louisiana State University-Shreveport	\$71,000	\$71,000	80
16	013-ART-07	Nicholls State University	\$100,204	\$100,204	78
17	017-ART-07	Southern University-Baton Rouge	\$113,057	\$113,057	77
18	015-ART-07	Nunez Community College	\$179,520	\$179,520	76
19	005-ART-07	Louisiana State University-Shreveport	\$44,900	\$44,900	72
			\$888,484	\$888,484	

TABLE III

Proposals Not Recommended for Funding					
Rank	Number	Institution	Request	Award	Rating
20	001-ART-07	Centenary College	\$243,000	\$0	64
21	016-ART-07	Southern University-Baton Rouge	\$44,191	\$0	63
22	023-ART-07	University of Louisiana-Monroe	\$96,128	\$0	62
23	018-ART-07	Southern University-New Orleans	\$27,900	\$0	60
			\$411,219	\$0	

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001ART-07

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ScratchPad Festival

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 12 (of 20 points)
 B.4 1 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$243,000
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel found the concept of the proposed writing festival/workshop to be both creative and interesting. However, the majority of the proposal's budget appears to focus on equipment not directly related to the festival, including requests for new seating, amplifiers, and speakers in the auditorium. Of the \$243,000 requested only \$33,000 had a direct bearing on the festival itself. Though the proposal's central concept has intriguing potential, the proposed festival appears poorly conceived. The panel was concerned that the authors specifically rejected the idea of seeking private sector support. The panel suggests the proposal be reconfigured as two separate proposals, one for a festival and one for theatre renovation, and resubmitted at a future date. No funding is recommended at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002-ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Cyber-Collaboratory for Music Instruction, Research,
Performance and Creativity

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$148,527</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$148,527</u>
	(If 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 proposal is well-written and details a recognizable need among many worthy proposals, improving arts education through technology enhancement. However, given the number of competitive requests for technological advancements, the panel did not find this proposal compelling enough. Funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003-ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mobile Design Studio for the Urban Landscape Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 98 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$142,143
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$130,693

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 is well-written, well-conceived, innovative, and timely. Although the panel found the proposal to be outstanding, in order to fund as many worthy proposals as possible, the panel does not recommend funding for "Other Equipment", a total reduction of \$11,450. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004-ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of LSUS Piano Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$71,000
Recommended Amount: \$71,000
(If 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.)

While the panel recognizes the need for piano lab technology in regular music programs, this request is a baseline request for equipment that would replace older units. There are a number of other proposals that are more innovative and the panel did not find this proposal particularly compelling. Equipment such as this, which is not used for more diverse educational applications, might be more appropriate for the "Undergraduate Enhancement" program. Funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005-ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Art Education Enhancement Using Digital Video Resources

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

72

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$44,900
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$44,900
(If 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 proposal is one of a number of requests to enhance arts education through technological upgrades. The panel did not find it as compelling as other similar proposals. The panel understands the rationale that course development may be hindered by a lack of digital video. However, a strong enough case for the anticipated impact on existing resources was not made. Funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Advanced Learning Technologies for Visual Arts

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$91,159
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$82,659

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 is well-written and clearly meets a need for advanced learning technologies. However, in order to fund as many worthy proposals as possible, the panel does not recommend funding for software, for a total reduction of \$8,500. The panel acknowledges the sizeable match by the institution to make these advanced learning technologies possible. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digitizing Etching and Lithography Facilities

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$51,636
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$51,636

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

The panel found this proposal for equipment to enhance existing etching and lithography facilities to be noteworthy and creative, and recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement to an Intelligent Lighting System for the Performance Spaces Within the Howard Center for the Performing Arts

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,933
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$41,000

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

The panel recognizes the strong need for enhancement of the lighting system of the Howard Center. However, in order to fund as many worthy proposals as possible, partial funding of \$41,000 is recommended. The panel suggests that the "Intelligent" fixtures be requested at a later time, that the need for the number conventional fixtures be reevaluated, or that more competitive prices be negotiated from vendors. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computerized Resources and Equipment for Apparel and
Textiles Education and Design

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 19 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$53,153
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$53,153

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

The panel found this proposal to be noteworthy for its enhancement of student learning and its encouragement of the creative construction process for apparel and textile design. It will enhance educational value for students in the region's economy. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Lighting Design and Technology Enhancement for Marquette Theatre

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$71,507
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$62,127

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

The panel commends this well-conceived lighting design and technology proposal. The equipment will certainly support theater arts and dance, contributing to the university's ability to be a leader in student education and community service. However, in order to support as many worthy proposals as possible, the panel recommends that funding for effects and the portable lighting system be reduced by \$9,380. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Video and Recording Expansion for Loyola University Music
Industry Studies Program

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$160,010
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$155,502

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

This well-written proposal builds on a strong foundation of music industry studies and provides a future in a growing field, digital recording, for Loyola students. Unfortunately, in order to support as many worthy proposals as possible, the panel does not recommend funding for software, a reduction of \$4,508. The panel commends the institutional match, which must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012-ART-07

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: New Digital Technologies and Equipment Enhancements for
Photography, Photo Printmaking and Advertising Design

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No _____ X _____

H. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$85,570</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$85,570</u>
	(If 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.)

Although the panel recognizes the need for equipment for new digital technologies and new media enhancement, there are a number of proposals with similar needs statewide. The Project Goals and Objectives are too general and vague. The proposal gives an impression of a "wish-list" that is unfocused. It would have been better received if it was more focused and specific in dealing with subject-area and needs as opposed to trying to equip three different areas. The panel recognizes the private sector and institutional matches, and recommends this proposal for full funding if additional money becomes available. If funded, the institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Studio Art and Art Education Technology Enhancement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$100,204 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$100,204 </u>
	(If 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 proposal, while well-written, identifies a problem present in many academic departments: not enough technology compared to the number of majors and a desire to move ahead in existing programs. While these are admirable objectives, the proposal would have been more compelling had the equipment requested been categorized and prioritized into smaller units and subgroups, making it possible for the panel to partially fund certain segments. The fundamental problem might concern departmental design rather than technology. Given the quality of other similar proposals, the panel finds this proposal too unfocused and ambitious, and recommends funding only if additional money becomes available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Renovation of Audio Infrastructure for the A. A. Fredericks
Fine Arts Building

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 3 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$227,566
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$182,838

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

This proposal is well-written and clearly articulates the needs for renovation of audio infrastructure in the Fine Arts Building. It is, however, the largest request received overall, and in order to meet the needs of other outstanding requests the panel does not recommend funding for items listed in the budget as System 2, System 7, and System 10, resulting in a reduction of \$44,728. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015-ART-07

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Art Programming in a Community College

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$179,520</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$179,520</u>
	(If 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 proposal's objectives are not particularly innovative or creative and represent very basic needs. It may be more appropriate for submission to the "Undergraduate Enhancement" or "Two-year Enhancement" programs. The panel recommends funding only if additional money becomes available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digitizing Departmental Visual Resources/Research Database

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 20 points)
 B.3 13 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 63 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$44,191
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

While the panel recognizes the need to digitize artworks for education purposes and acquire slides of nonwestern art in particular, this proposal is not well-conceived or detailed. It does not provide an adequate explanation for the extensive travel and salary. It is unclear exactly how the images would be acquired. There is most likely a more efficient way to acquire these slides. Funding is not recommended at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017-ART-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Cocurricular Theatrical Lighting and Sound
Infrastructure

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount: <u>\$113,057</u> Recommended Amount: <u>\$113,057</u> (If 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 proposal is one of several similar requests for renovations of theatrical lighting. The panel found this request to be the least compelling. The writing is unfocused and difficult to follow, and the matching funds are minimal. The panel recommends funding only if additional funds become available.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018ART-07

INSTITUTION: Southern University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Faculty Research and Teaching and Learning Technology
Enhancements for Fine Arts

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 20 points)
B.3 13 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

60

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$27,900
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

While the panel recognizes that faculty research, teaching, and learning are important parts of the educational process, the proposal is poorly conceived. There is a great deal of repetition from one category to the next, with no concrete description of the goals and objectives. The panel believes there might be a more appropriate forum for a request for such basic needs. Funding is not recommended at this time.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019-ART-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding School of Music Resources with a Digital
Multimedia Recording Facility Integrating Audio and Video

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$145,706</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$145,706</u>
	(If 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.)

Although the panel recognizes the need for technology enhancement, there are a number of more compelling requests in this area during this submission cycle. Though the proposal is well-conceived, funding is only recommended if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020ART-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: La Musique C'est la Vie

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 20 (of 20 points)
B.3 23 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

96

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$41,670
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$41,670

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

The panel finds this proposal to be most impressive. It appears to strongly support a number of diverse constituencies in the State. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021-ART-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Studio Enhancement for Intaglio, Relief/Typesetting Technology

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

87

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$96,480
Recommended Amount: \$87,880

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 that allows for the infusion of the latest technologies into the print-making program. The panel acknowledges the strong potential for the program to be a model statewide and regionally. Because of the high number of competitive proposals, this proposal is recommended for partial funding with reductions in areas of equipment for maintenance, storage and safety. The panel notes and approves the institutional and private sector matches, which must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022-ART-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Multi-Disciplinary Metal Fabrication Facility for the College of the Arts

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$114,099
Recommended Amount: \$93,832

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

The panel finds the proposal innovative and is particularly impressed with the project's interdisciplinary nature. In working with programs in the College of the Arts and Architecture and Interior Design, the project will allow for far greater teaching capacity. In order to fund as many worthy proposals as possible, the panel does not recommend funding for shipping, installation, and fringe benefits, for a total reduction of \$20,267. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 023-ART-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Studio Technology Enhancement and Integration

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$96,128
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal is for basic equipment in several areas. The panel finds the sizable request to be overly ambitious with requests for varying types of equipment ranging from very inexpensive to fairly expensive. As there were a number of more innovative and compelling requests that more clearly met the spirit of the Enhancement Program, the panel does not recommend funding for such a basic list of fundamental needs at this time.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Arts
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001ART-07 ART	ScratchPad Festival	Centenary College (Theatre/Dance);	Don Hoooper;	1	\$ 243,000
				Total	\$ 243,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
002ART-07 ART	A Cyber-Collaboratory for Music Instruction, Research, Performance and Creativity	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Music);	Stephen David Beck; Evelyn Orman; Griffin Campbell; Jeffrey Perry; Michael Bellinger;	1	\$ 148,527
				Total	\$ 148,527
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

E=Primarily an Equipment Request
N=Not Primarily an Equipment Request

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003ART-07 ART	Mobile Design Studio for the Urban Landscape Lab	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Landscape Architecture);	Elizabeth Mossop; Brad Cantrell; Karla Christensen; Wes Michaels;	1	\$ 142,143
				Total	\$ 142,143
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
004ART-07 ART	Enhancement of LSUS Piano Lab	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Music);	LaWanda Blakeney;	1	\$ 71,000
				Total	\$ 71,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
005ART-07 ART	Art Education Enhancement Using Digital Video Resources	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Fine Arts);	Jason W. Mackowiak; M. LaMoyne Batten;	1	\$ 44,900
				Total	\$ 44,900
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006ART-07 ART	Advanced Learning Technologies for Visual Arts	Louisiana Tech University (Art);	Jerry L. Berg, II; Adrienne Hooker; Jonathan Donehoo;	1	\$ 91,159
				Total	\$ 91,159
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
007ART-07 ART	Digitizing Etching and Lithography Facilities	Louisiana Tech University (Art);	Marie Bukowski;	1	\$ 51,636
				Total	\$ 51,636
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
008ART-07 ART	Enhancement to an Intelligent Lighting System for the Performance Spaces Within the Howard Center for the Performing Arts	Louisiana Tech University (Theatre);	Mark Guinn;	1	\$ 67,933
				Total	\$ 67,933
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009ART-07 ART	Computerized Resources and Equipment for Apparel and Textiles Education and Design	Louisiana Tech University (Merchandising and Consumer Studies);	Lori Myers; Aimee Rambin; Kathleen Heiden; Linda Sivils;	1	\$ 53,153
				Total	\$ 53,153
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
010ART-07 ART	Lighting Design and Technology Enhancement for Marquette Theatre	Loyola University New Orleans (Theatre Arts and Dance);	Georgia Gresham; Robert Self;	1	\$ 71,507
				Total	\$ 71,507
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
011 ART-07 ART	Video and Recording Expansion for Loyola University Music Industry Studies Program	Loyola University New Orleans (Music and Fine Arts);	Sanford Hinderlie; Jim Gabour; John Snyder;	1	\$ 160,010
				Total	\$ 160,010
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012ART-07 ART	New Digital Technologies and Equipment Enhancements for Photography, Photo Printmaking and Advertising Design	McNeese State University (Studio Art/Printmaking);	Larry Schuh; Lynn Reynolds;	1	\$ 85,570
				Total	\$ 85,570
E	Proposal is a New Request				
013ART-07 ART	Studio Art and Art Education Technology Enhancement	Nicholls State University (Art);	Jean Donegan; Deborah Lillie; Jeff Brown; Ross Jahnke; Trisha Z. Dubina;	1	\$ 100,204
				Total	\$ 100,204
E	Proposal is a New Request				
014ART-07 ART	The Renovation of Audio Infrastructure for the A. A. Fredericks Fine Arts Building	Northwestern State University (Theatre);	Scott Burrell; J. Mark Thompson; Masahito Kuroda; Shawn Parr;	1	\$ 227,566
				Total	\$ 227,566
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015ART-07 ART	Enhancing Art Programming in a Community College	Nunez Community College (Art);	Juliette Paul;	1	\$ 179,520
				Total	\$ 179,520
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
016ART-07 ART	Digitizing Departmental Visual Resources/Research Database	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Visual Arts);	Onoyom Godfrey Ukpong; Martin Payton;	1	\$ 44,191
				Total	\$ 44,191
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
017ART-07 ART	Enhancement of Cocurricular Theatrical Lighting and Sound Infrastructure	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Speech Communication and Theatre Arts);	Daryl M. Wedwick;	1	\$ 113,057
				Total	\$ 113,057
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018ART-07 ART	Faculty Research and Teaching and Learning Technology Enhancements for Fine Arts	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Research and Strategic Initiatives);	William Belisle; David Alajani; Gary Oaks;	1	\$ 27,900
				Total	\$ 27,900
N Proposal is a New Request					
019ART-07 ART	Expanding School of Music Resources with a Digital Multimedia Recording Facility Integrating Audio and Video	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Music);	Garth Alper; Andrea Loewy; Jeffrey George; Robert Willey;	1	\$ 145,706
				Total	\$ 145,706
E Proposal is a New Request					
020ART-07 ART	La Musique C'est la Vie	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Cultural and Eco-Tourism);	Jennifer Cooper; Carl A. Brasseaux;	1	\$ 41,670
				Total	\$ 41,670
N Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021ART-07 ART	Studio Enhancement for Intaglio, Relief/Typesetting Technology	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Visual Arts);	Brian Kelly; Onezieme Mouton; Steven Breaux;	1	\$ 96,480
				Total	\$ 96,480
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
022ART-07 ART	A Multi -Disciplinary Metal Fabrication Facility for the College of the Arts	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Architecture and Design);	Andy F. Loewy; Brooke M. Davis; Cody S. Bush; Jerry J. Malinowski; W. Geoffrey Gjertson;	1	\$ 114,099
				Total	\$ 114,099
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
023ART-07 ART	Studio Technology Enhancement and Integration	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Art);	Gary Ratcliff; Cliff Tresner;	1	\$ 96,128
				Total	\$ 96,128
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Arts for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
23	\$ 2,417,059	\$ 2,417,059	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

- A. For Equipment Proposals
- B. For Non-Equipment Proposals

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07

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 52 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 15 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 5 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 required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- _____ of 6 pts. C.1 To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- _____ of 1 pt. C.2 Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?
- _____ of 3 pts. C.3 To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

- _____ of 2 pts. E.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either E.2a OR E.2b:

- _____ of 10 pts. E.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?
- E.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES___ NO_____ G.1 If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2006-07
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 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 5 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 required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT--Total of 12 points

_____ of 2 pts. D.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

NOTE TO REVIEWER: Depending on the discipline of the submitting department or unit, provide rating points for either D.2a OR D.2b:

_____ of 10 pts. D.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?

D.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. E.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

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:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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: _____