

## **FY 2006-07 LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

### **ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT – AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

#### **Introduction**

An Agriculture Review Panel consisting of Professor David B. Beasley (chair), North Carolina State University (Agricultural and Biological Engineering); Professor Dan Schaefer, University of Wisconsin-Madison (Animal Sciences); and Professor Linda Lee, Purdue University (Agronomy) met March 6-7, 2007 in Baton Rouge to evaluate twenty-two (22) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Board of Regents Support Fund (BoRSF).

Panel members received all proposals, the FY 2006-07 Request for Proposals (RFP), a summary of the proposals submitted, and other pertinent materials including the previous (2004) review report early in 2007. The reviewers read all of the proposals and materials, and arrived at individual rankings prior to the meeting in Baton Rouge. During the evaluation process, the reviewers fully discussed the merits of each proposal; in each case unanimous agreement was reached. It is the group's consensus that all proposals received thorough and fair evaluations based on the criteria enumerated in the RFP.

The review resulted in fourteen (14) of the twenty-two (22) proposals submitted being recommended for either full or partial funding with an allocation of \$889,313. (See Table I for a list of proposals highly recommended for funding.) In each case in which partial support was recommended, the funding level was determined after a careful review of the budget that resulted in an amount that corresponded to the most urgent needs of the project. Three (3) proposals were recommended for partial funding **if additional monies become available**. (See Table II for a list of these proposals.) Only five (5) proposals were not recommended for funding. (See Table III for those proposals.) A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are appended at the end of this report.

The reviewers take this opportunity to encourage the Board of Regents to allocate additional funds for the Agriculture component of the Traditional Enhancement program during the next review cycle.

**TABLE I**

**AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
1	94	014AG-07	LSUS	\$14,410	\$14,410
2	92	015AG-07	LA TECH	\$91,845	\$91,845
3	91	022AG-07	ULM	\$49,815	\$49,815
4	89	009AG-07	LSUAG	\$51,547	\$51,547
5	87	010AG-07	LSUAG	\$62,864	\$62,864
6	85	001AG-07	LSUAG	\$118,284	\$91,461
7	84	003AG-07	LSUAG	\$79,556	\$79,556
8	83	011AG-07	LSU-BR	\$147,700	\$142,300
9	82	021AG-07	ULL	\$64,381	\$64,381
10	80	004AG-07	LSUAG	\$141,000	\$131,000
11	79	016AG-07	LA TECH	\$16,072	\$16,072
12	78	007AG-07	LSUAG	\$32,103	\$32,103
13	77	013AG-07	LSUE	\$130,684	\$39,238
14	76	020AG-07	NIC	\$23,721	\$22,721
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$1,023,982</b>	<b>\$889,313</b>

**TABLE II**

**AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

**PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING  
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
15	73	017AG-07	LA TECH	\$41,334	\$25,000
16	72	018AG-07	LA TECH	\$41,643	\$30,000
17	71	002AG-07	LSUAG	\$111,850	\$56,500
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$194,827</b>	<b>\$111,500</b>

**TABLE III**

**AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<b>RANK</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PROPOSAL NO.</b>	<b>INSTITUTION</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED</b>	<b>SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED</b>
18	66	008AG-07	LSUAG	\$40,382	\$0		
19	65	019AG-07	LA TECH	\$124,867	\$0		
20	64	005AG-07	LSUAG	\$230,000	\$0		
21	63	006AG-07	LSUAG	\$207,935	\$0		
22	62	012AG-07	LSU-BR	\$234,496	\$0	\$49,956	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$837,680</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$49,956</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Richard L. Bengtson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: An Enhanced One Stop, Full Service, Agricultural Weather Information System

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 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 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 2 (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 RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$118,284  
 Recommended Amount: \$91,461

**COMMENTS:**

The proposed project is to enhance the capability and reliability of the current weather information station. The primary items requested include: (1) a server for enhanced Web capability and to handle large datasets; (2) a laptop for testing new software for enhancing Web-based displays; (3) enhanced sensor equipment such as rain gauges, wind sensors, temperature and humidity sensors, radio links, and a portable weather station; and (4) a new truck for transporting and servicing portable weather stations. It appears that, for the most part, the sensors requested will replace older sensors that are currently being used. The panel realizes that it is difficult for weather stations to acquire infrastructure support from federal funding; therefore, being successful in this type of local State-specific opportunity is important to advance contributions to business, government, and education. If the same amount of data are being collected, then the server must just be used for the Web-based, value-added products. It seems clear that there is need of enhanced capabilities for producing value-added products consistent with some of the cutting-edge, university-based weather stations, which is why some of the computer items are being requested. However, it was not clear what qualified person would develop the software for the value-added products, which is key to the project's success. In the past, an ABE programmer's time was donated for the weather station, which the panel assumes is how the proposed value-added products will be facilitated. The truck is a disallowed budgetary item (page 13 of the Enhancement RFP). The panel suggests that the PIs seek donation of a truck from a local car distributor. Free advertising for the dealership could be painted on the side or back of the truck. Funding of \$91,461 is recommended for all items but the truck. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 002AG-07

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Regina P. Bracy

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Plant and Water Diagnostic Lab for Developing Landscape  
BMPs and IPM

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 71 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 11 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 5 (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 10 (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 \_\_\_\_\_

*Only stated no BoR funds awarded*

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY  
RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Requested Amount:**

\$111,850

**Recommended Amount:**

\$56,500

(If additional funds  
become available)

**COMMENTS:**

The proposed project would enhance a newly created Landscape Horticulture Research and Extension Center at the Hammond research station by establishing a plant and water diagnostic lab to accomplish the research objectives of the new program that are geared to the needs of the growing Green Industry. Research items requested include equipment for quantifying, measuring and analyzing plant and water quality for landscape storm water mitigation and fertility studies; wetland plant nutrient cycling systems; insect growth chambers; and moisture/temperature sensors and data loggers for plant and insect studies. The objectives listed in section B1 seem to be generic to the newly established program as a whole and are not well detailed; the specific roles of the faculty listed in section D1 are not well articulated. The justification for the plant species choices, nature of the runoff problem, suitability of test sites, and relevance of the IPM is lacking or absent. It seems understood that the presence and enhancement of this facility will promote faculty development; however, what is articulated in the proposal was very generic. The connection between the equipment being requested and the statement related to how this project would help to achieve recognized eminence is not well made. Some of the requested weather station equipment should be linked to the university's weather station needs. Many of the supplies requested should be furnished by the institution, including general supplies, electrical work, and basic lab items like the oven and muffle furnace. The panel recommends that, if additional funds become available, only items 1 and 3 be funded (\$56,500); the institutional match may be reduced by approximately 50%.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Donal F. Day

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Identification of Organic Compounds in Sugar Process Streams Using Gas Chromatography and Mass Spectrometry

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

84
----

 (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 18 (of 20 points)  
B.4 1 (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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

*but poor summary of results*

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$79,556

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$79,556

## COMMENTS:

The Audubon Sugar Institute requests a GC/MS for analysis of compounds related to lignin breakdown products that is important for optimizing valuable byproducts and those associated with color characteristics in sugar products. Although the applicants have access to GC/MS services, the panel recognizes the inadequacy of depending on others for analysis of research samples that require knowledge specific to the research area. The stated need and how it fits into the existing program is well articulated throughout the proposal. The panel has some concern that the PI's proposal submissions to federal funding sources appear limited, but these should increase with the capabilities brought about by acquiring the requested equipment. The panel advises the PI to investigate other GC/MS manufacturer options. One panel member recently purchased a GC/MS triple quadrupole from Shimadzu that far surpasses the sensitivity, ease of use, and flexibility of other GC/MS systems that she has used. The panel recommends full funding (\$79,556) of this proposal.

One-Year Equipment

(RatingForms06-07.xls:jh)

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gregg Henderson

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Liquid-Chromotography Mass Spectrometer

## 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 6 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 

80
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 0 (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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

*Provided summary of BoR awards*

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$141,000

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$131,000

## COMMENTS:

Funds are requested to purchase a LC/MS (replacing an existing LC/MS purchased with USDA monies in 1998) for analysis of polar compounds related to termite effector studies conducted in collaboration with the departments of Biological Sciences and Entomology. Currently, the research team is limited to an outdated GC/MS, which is likely to have lower orders of magnitude and lower sensitivity than the new GC/MS units and is limited to compounds that are thermally stable or that must be derivatived. A new LC/MS would indeed remove these limitations. Although the proposal described in too much detail the research projects that would utilize the new instrumentation, evaluation of achievements to be gained with the new instrumentation is lacking. The institutional description and rationale for the project are poorly written, although related information could be found in other parts of the proposal. The project's connection with the forestry component could have been stronger. The contributions to faculty development are not well articulated. Existing equipment includes a Finnegan LC-ion trap, which one of the panel members concurred with the applicant is an unreliable and high maintenance instrument. The panel notes the absence of any institutional match. The panel recommends funding of the actual instrument (\$131,000), but also recommends that supplies, travel, and training totaling \$10,000 should come from institutional or other sources.

One-Year Equipment

(RatingForms06-07.xls:jh)



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Roy J. Martin

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Proof of Concept Research Enhancement for Bioactive Food Components

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
B.3 11 (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 9 (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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

H. Total Score: 

64
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$230,000  
Recommended Amount: \$0

## COMMENTS:

The proposal seeks funds to purchase a microCT scanner for in vivo measurements in comparative animal studies as part of a Functional Food Bioassay Core Lab established as a result of seeded research grants (2004) from the Functional Food Program. It appears that sometime in the past year the core lab was envisioned to serve a large core of seeded faculty, but details about what is currently contained in this lab were not supplied. Although such a scanner is valuable, it is not clear if the benefits are cost effective, and maintenance costs can be prohibitive. This expense is also difficult to assess on a relative scale without details on the value of existing instrumentation in the core lab. The applicants superficially explained how the scanner would reduce some of the uncertainty in measurements and experimental design, but did not demonstrate anything spectacular that could be found with the scanner that could not be found with existing techniques. Why cannot proof of concept data be obtained using scanners available on campus? Although it would seem that such instrumentation would give the participating departments a competitive edge (more so after some proof of concept study using the scanner was done), the applicants did not fully articulate how having the scanner would catapult them to success, as requested in B.3. The research team is large, but it is unclear which team member has experience to use scanner information. Sending a faculty member on a mini-sabbatical to achieve a better understanding of the advantages and limits of such instrumentation would seem germane. In terms of additional funding, there are so many participating departments that if all the faculty involved in the project and their department heads believed that this scanner would have a huge impact, each head should surely be willing to contribute some nominal amount (\$5-10K per collaborating department), which would demonstrate true commitment to the project and reduce the amount being requested from BoRSF. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert C. Reigh

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Nutrition and Genetics Research in Aquaculture

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**H. Total Score:** 63 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 11 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$207,935

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$0

**COMMENTS:**

The applicants address the need to enhance LSU-Ag's aquaculture program through purchase of laboratory equipment to cover the capability that they once had by using what is now obsolete, no-longer serviced instrumentation and to add new equipment to meet the needs of the nutrition and genetics programs. The Dairy Improvement Center and a commercial facility (Genex, Inc.) may have to reduce access to the applicants in order to accommodate their own growth. The need for aquaculture research is well articulated, but the instrumentation that exists in the aquaculture program at LSU-AG is not. The project goals are only generically stated: there are few specifics, no measurable objectives, and a weak work plan. The applicants detailed how the current aquaculture facility has eminence, but failed to state how funding of the current proposal is key to retaining or increasing that eminence. Contributions to faculty development are restricted to improving their teaching effectiveness, but explaining how the equipment would enhance the PIs' ability to conduct higher quality research to in turn enhance their competitiveness for receiving grants would have been very beneficial. No additional funding sources are listed on the budget page. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter W. Rein

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fluorescence Spectrophotometry for Research and  
Development: Value-Added Products Derived from Cane Sugar  
and Biomass Processing

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>  X  </u>	No	<u>          </u>
A.2		<u>  3  </u>	(of 5 points)	
A.3		<u>  4  </u>	(of 5 points)	

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1	<u>  5  </u>	(of 6 points)
C.2	<u>  1  </u>	(of 1 point)
C.3	<u>  2  </u>	(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1	<u>  4  </u>	(of 5 points)
B.2	<u> 12  </u>	(of 15 points)
B.3	<u> 18  </u>	(of 20 points)
B.4	<u>  3  </u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u>  1  </u>	(of 2 points)
B.6	<u>  3  </u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	Yes <u>  X  </u>	No <u>          </u>

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u> 12  </u>	(of 12 points)
-----	--------------	----------------

**F. Additional Funding Sources**

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1	<u>  0  </u>	(of 4 points)
-----	--------------	---------------

**G. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes <u>  X  </u>	No <u>          </u>
-----	------------------	----------------------

H. Total Score: 78 (of 100 points)

*Noteworthy results seemed lacking*

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$32,103  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$32,103  </u>

COMMENTS:

Funds for purchasing a scanning fluorescence spectrophotometer to further the mission of the Audubon Sugar Institute are being requested. The likely benefits of adding this instrumentation to the ASI relative to its cost are small, but the instrument will enhance faculty research, student education, and may enhance recruitment of higher quality students. The panel suggests that the PIs converse with others working on color-related compounds in the institute (Dr. Day, et al.) for identification of compounds found to fluoresce that lead to color formation with GC/MS. The panel recommends full funding of the fluorescence detector.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Benito Stradl

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Isocratic High Performance Liquid Chromotography (HPLC)  
System for Sugar Analyses

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 11 (of 20 points)  
B.4 0 (of 5 points)  
B.5 0 (of 2 points)  
B.6 0 (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: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$40,382  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

COMMENTS:

This is a request for an HPLC to be used to increase capacity for cane process sample analyses. It is unclear why a limited-utility isocratic LC would be chosen over a gradient LC, especially when the Sugar Institute's mission is to upgrade. It would have been helpful if reviewers knew what the current sample load for sugar determinations is, how much capacity is needed, and the anticipated sample analytical capacity if this HPLC purchase were approved. Apparently the current HPLC has been used for routine service analyses, so it seems reasonable that service fee revenue could be generated to accomplish LC replacement. Evaluation of goal attainment was not addressed. The panel views the institutional match composed only of salaries, fringe benefits, and indirect costs dubiously; a cash match for equipment would have demonstrated more commitment to the project. Funding is not recommended for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cathleen C. Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment for Enhancement of Nutrition and Management Research with Dairy Cattle

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 15 (of 15 points)  
B.3 17 (of 20 points)  
B.4 4 (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: 

89
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$51,547

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$51,547

## COMMENTS:

The applicants' goal is to obtain a system for electronically capturing milk weight on an individual cow basis at selected milkings, a system that is envisioned to facilitate student and faculty research projects. It would have been helpful had the panel been apprised of the current methods used to measure and collect milk weights, since this knowledge would have helped us appreciate the extent to which this equipment will be an enhancement. The research plan was general in nature, and presumably justified on the basis of general infrastructure enhancement. Examples of research topics that would be addressed, and evidence of enhanced collaborations and economic impact should have been mentioned in the proposal. Nevertheless, the qualifications of the PIs and evidence of university support through pledged (in-cash) matching funds are good. Full funding is recommended at \$51,547.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College - Agricultural Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Y. Jun Xu

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Analytical Capability for Research and Teaching  
in Watershed Hydrology and Water Quality

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

H. Total Score: 87 (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 16 (of 20 points)  
 B.4 3 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$62,864

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$62,864

COMMENTS:

The applicant wishes to purchase a 3-D velocity stream profiler with acoustic doppler technology for high resolution streamflow measurements and an environmental monitoring buoy with continuous data transmission for real-time water quality monitoring. These items will enhance the capability of the LSU Agricultural Center's Watershed Hydrology Lab. Research is emphasized in the justification for this request, and several ongoing research projects will benefit from the purchase of this equipment. The PI has been very successful in acquiring external grant funds. Full funding (\$62,864) is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011AG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yan Chen

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fabrication and Surface Characterization of Carbonized and Activated Bio-Composites

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 15 (of 15 points)  
B.3 19 (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 0 (of 4 points)

## G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 

83
----

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$147,700

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$142,300

## COMMENTS:

The PI seeks to develop value-added textile products from cotton and bagasse fibers by increasing the porosity of cotton fibers due to carbonization and carbon activation. The proposal requests funds to purchase an inverse GC for surface characterization of composites. The PI should have defined carbonization and "inverse" GC. Although the PI seems to have the expertise needed to make full use of the requested instrumentation, there will be only limited impact on the faculty as a whole. The preliminary data in Figs. 4 and 9 should have been better explained, and Figs. 4 (yellow line) and 10 were unreadable. There are many variables involved in the in-depth study of surface characterization. An experimental design or research approach that clarifies the plan for navigating through this multi-factorial maze would have been helpful. Currently the PI has considerable funding, but only from State sources; one small NSF proposal is pending. Also, there was no description as to how the \$500,000 from the Governor's Biotechnology Initiative grant is being used or about how that funding relates to this proposal. An institutional cash match for this proposal should have been sought. Reduced funding of \$142,300 is recommended, with software being funded through other means. The panel believes that the requested instrumentation will enhance the PI's research program and competitiveness for federal funds. Nevertheless, because the panel is gravely concerned that the recommended funds will primarily benefit a single PI, the panel will expect **other "external" funding (i.e., non-BoRSF)** to appear in the PI's record if future proposals request more BoR support.

One-Year Equipment

(RatingForms06-07.xls:jh)

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012AG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: M. E. B. Garrison

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Communication and Leadership Skills in  
Agriculture

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

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

**C. 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 5 (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 62 (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 10 (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 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 X No \_\_\_\_\_

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

	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>		<u>\$234,496</u>	<u>\$49,956</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

**COMMENTS:**

The goal of this proposal is to build and equip a state-of-the-art agricultural communications studio to facilitate students' experiential learning in oral, written and electronic communications. This goal should have been stated as a "major objective." As it is presented, the objectives and equipment purchases are not well linked. The specific role of each of the faculty members listed as contributors is not clarified. "Leadership" skill enhancement was mentioned, but not described in specifics. The panel noted in the Current and Pending Support form of one of the co-PIs that in FY 2005-06, BoR funds of over \$250,000 were received for communication studios in three colleges. The relationship of the present proposal to that funding, if such relationship exists, is unclear. It is also unclear how the individual(s) to be hired for the project would be sustained after BoRSF funding ends. This proposal's cover sheet was marked as being primarily equipment-related; however, the budget is very heavily weighted to salary, fringe benefits and stipends (with little justification as required by the Enhancement Program RFP). The institutional match of salaries and fringe benefits is questionable. No funding is recommended.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013AG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jameel Al-Dujaili

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment to Enhance Agriculture Science Lecture and Laboratory Courses at LSUE-A Rural, Two-Year Campus

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 11 (of 15 points)  
B.3 16 (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 11 (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 Requested Amount: \$130,684  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$39,238

## COMMENTS:

The goal of this proposal is to purchase a variety of laboratory equipment, audio-visual equipment, and subject-matter CDs to modernize the curriculum at this two-year campus. CDs are an easy method for obtaining classroom information; however, in the experience of the panel this kind of information medium is quickly outdated. The institutional in-kind matches are of dubious substance. It is unclear that other sources of funding for the project have been sought. This proposal is recommended for partial funding at \$39,238, but the full institutional match pledged is expected to be maintained. Within the constraints of this reduced funding, the PI should select a items and item counts that allow him to assemble cogent enhancements to the educational offerings at LSU-E.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014AG-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Dalton R. Gossett

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Agriculture Education at LSUS

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 94 (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 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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$14,410

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$14,410

COMMENTS:

The goal of this proposal is to purchase water quality monitoring equipment for use by undergraduates. Samples of water will be collected at prescribed sites in connection with the Red River Research Station wetlands and then students will draw conclusions regarding the value of constructed wetlands that receive agricultural runoff. AGRI 101 students should have a very beneficial experience in sample collection and analysis. The thoughtfully structured research exercises are consistent with the view that "open inquiry" is an effective method of laboratory teaching. Solute concentrations obtained with the requested monitoring equipment will be checked with the department's atomic absorption spectrophotometer. The individual who will bear active responsibility for maintenance of the water quality equipment was not clearly identified; such maintenance will be very important to the life of the requested units. The institutional (in-cash) matching funds are commendable. Full funding (\$14,410) is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter W. Gallagher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Environmental Control System for Lomax Hall Greenhouse Complex

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

92
----

 (of 100 points)

## 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 4 (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 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 RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$91,845  
Recommended Amount: \$91,845

## COMMENTS:

This proposal is a very well-conceived plan to renovate and reinvigorate the Lomax Hall Greenhouse Complex at Louisiana Tech University. The project's objectives are clear, the matching monies from the university are excellent, and the impact on both teaching and research will be far ranging and positive. The panel recommends full funding (\$91,845) of this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jeff B. Hillard

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Rejuvenation of Compacted Pastures and Turfgrass

## 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 6 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
B.3 16 (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 2 (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: \$16,072

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$16,072

## COMMENTS:

This proposal presents a plan for studying and remediating soil compaction in compacted pastures and turfgrass areas at Louisiana Tech by using innovative subsurface tillage equipment developed and manufactured in New Zealand. The objectives are straightforward, the impact on the academic and research programs should be positive, and the budget is reasonable. The panel recommends full funding (\$16,072) of this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gary A. Kennedy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Novel Calcium-Sensing for Early Diagnosis of Milk Fever

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 9 (of 15 points)  
B.3 14 (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 9 (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 \_\_\_\_\_

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$41,334

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$25,000 (If additional funds become available)

## COMMENTS:

The applicants would like to acquire equipment as they attempt to develop a simple test for determining the existence of milk fever (hypocalcemia) in dairy cattle. The panel commends the PIs for a novel approach, but also notes that studies in this area are ongoing at a number of locations. The institutional match is reasonable; however, an industry match would have strengthened the proposal. The impact that this work would have on students would be relatively small, but its importance to the PIs' research program and the industry it serves could be potentially large. However, the budget contains a significant amount for disposable supplies, which the panel feels should be a university responsibility. The panel recommends that funding requested be reduced to \$25,000 and the remainder of the request come from institutional or other funding sources. Hence, provided Louisiana Tech University maintains its promised institutional match and if additional funds become available, partial funding of \$25,000 is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Aleta C. Overby

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The North Louisiana Therapeutic Riding Center Project

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

72
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 15 (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 8 (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:

\$41,643

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommended Amount:

\$30,000

(If additional funds become available)

## COMMENTS:

This proposal requests funds to equip the North Louisiana Therapeutic Riding Center at Louisiana Tech University to be able to receive certification from the North American Riding for the Handicapped Association (NARHA) program, which includes certified instructors associated with the Center and appropriate facilities. It appears that only one faculty member is involved in the project and no higher-level support is mentioned as having a vested interest, which seriously weakens the request. Enabling the riding center to educate students in this discipline would enhance student learning and the eminence of the unit, and may have some general economic value. The panel recommends that the amount requested be reduced to \$30,000 and that the remainder of the request come from institutional or other funding sources. Hence, provided Louisiana Tech University maintains its promised institutional match and if additional funds become available, partial funding of \$30,000 is recommended for this project.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019AG-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Erin Tucker

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Tech University Meat Science Laboratory Enhancement

## A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

## C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 

65
----

 (of 100 points)

## B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
B.2 10 (of 15 points)  
B.3 13 (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 2 (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: \$124,867  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

## COMMENTS:

The current state of the Meat Lab facility at Louisiana Tech University is not discussed in the proposal. The evaluation criteria (i.e., class use and sales of products) are dubious, since current measures (student involvement in courses) and sales volume were not presented. The project summary contains little concrete as to what is being requested and is followed by more than two pages of an institutional description that contributed little to the panel's understanding and assessment of the proposal. The rationale for the work infers but still does not explicitly state what the request will facilitate, i.e., what is being requested. Finally, the panel believes that the instructors are teaching and supervising an array of courses/programs that will dilute their focus on the Meat Lab. No funding is recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020AG-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Don J. Dufresne

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Farm Equipment for Increased Field  
Laboratory Experience

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)  
 B.3 16 (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 0 (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: \$23,721  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$22,721

COMMENTS:

This proposal will fund acquisition of a tractor and a number of implements to enhance a hands-on teaching program at Nicholls State University. The combination of agriculture and culinary science truly exemplifies the "Farm-to-Table" idea put forth in the proposal. The lack of institutional match, however, creates a question as to the commitment of Nicholls State University to this project. The panel recommends reduced funding of \$22,721, with the \$1,000 amount for fertilizer and insecticides to be supplied by the university or through other sources.



# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021AG-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Caryl Chlan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Proteomics Analysis of Plant-Microbe Interactions

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

H. Total Score: 

82
----

 (of 100 points)

## 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 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: \$64,381

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$64,381

## COMMENTS:

This proposal will expand the capabilities of the UL Lafayette Biology Department in the area of proteomics technology and allow for expanded interaction with USDA and other agricultural entities in and beyond Louisiana. The disciplinary area chosen for enhancement has strong potential and the panel feels that this proposal, even though submitted by a Biology Department faculty member, is in fact quite appropriate for agricultural funding. The panel recommends full funding (\$64,381).

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022AG-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Joe Pankey

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Agricultural Lecture and Laboratory Classes at the University of Louisiana at Monroe

## 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 9 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b \_\_\_\_\_ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 

91
----

 (of 100 points)

## 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 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 4 (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: \$49,815  
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$49,815

## COMMENTS:

This well-written proposal seeks to modernize the Agribusiness program at the University of Louisiana at Monroe by introducing students to precision agriculture technology, improving the soils teaching lab, and conducting small plot research with improved equipment. The panel concurs that the objectives, work plan, and budget are all reasonable and the impact on the program will be substantial. The panel recommends full funding (\$49,815) of this proposal.

# Appendix A

## Summary of Proposals Submitted

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

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>001AG-07 AGR</b>	An Enhanced One Stop, Full Service, Agricultural Weather Information System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Biological & Agricultural Engineering);	Richard L. Bengtson; John M. Grymes, III;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 118,284</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 118,284</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				
<b>002AG-07 AGR</b>	Plant and Water Diagnostic Lab for Developing Landscape BMPs and IPM	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Hammond Research Station);	Regina P. Bracy; Yan Chen;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 111,850</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 111,850</b>
<b>E</b>	Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>				

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

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>003AG-07 AGR</b>	Identification of Organic Compounds in Sugar Process Streams Using Gas Chromatography and Mass Spectrometry	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Audubon Sugar Institute);	Donal F. Day; Brian E. White;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 79,556</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 79,556</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>004AG-07 AGR</b>	Liquid-Chromotography Mass Spectrometer	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Entomology);	Gregg Henderson; Roger Laine;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 141,000</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 141,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>005AG-07 AGR</b>	Proof of Concept Research Enhancement for Bioactive Food Components	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Human Ecology);	Roy J. Martin; Donal F. Day; Fredrick Enright; J. Samuel Godber; Jack N. Losso; Joan M. King; Jun Zhou; Michael J. Keenan; Richard T. Tulley; William Hansel; Witoon Prinyawiwatkul;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 230,000</b>
<b>E</b>				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 230,000</b>
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>006AG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancement of Nutrition and Genetics Research in Aquaculture	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Aquaculture Research Station);	Robert C. Reigh; Terrence R. Tiersch;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 207,935</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 207,935</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>007AG-07 AGR</b>	Fluorescence Spectrophotometry for Research and Development: Value-Added Products Derived from Cane Sugar and Biomass Processing	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Audubon Sugar Institute);	Peter W. Rein; Lee R. Madsen, II;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 32,103</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 32,103</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>008AG-07 AGR</b>	Isocratic High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) System for Sugar Analyses	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Audubon Sugar Institute);	Benito Stradl; Brian E. White;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 40,382</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 40,382</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>009AG-07 AGR</b>	Equipment for Enhancement of Nutrition and Management Research with Dairy Cattle	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Animal Sciences);	Cathleen C. Williams; Bruce F. Jenny; Charles F. Hutchinson;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 51,547</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 51,547</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>010AG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancing Analytical Capability for Research and Teaching in Watershed Hydrology and Water Quality	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (Renewable Natural Resources);	Y. Jun Xu;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 62,864</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 62,864</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>011AG-07 AGR</b>	Fabrication and Surface Characterization of Carbonized and Activated Bio-Composites	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Human Ecology);	Yan Chen;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 147,700</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 147,700</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>012AG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancing Communication and Leadership Skills in Agriculture	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Agriculture);	M. E. B. Garrison; Bonnie Belleau; Carol O'Neil; Cathleen Williams; Dennis Ingram; Janet Fox; Kevin McCarter; Lillian Bridwell - Bowles; Maud Walsh; Steve Henning;	<b>1</b> <b>2</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 234,496</b> <b>\$ 49,956</b> <b>\$ 284,452</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>013AG-07 AGR</b>	Equipment to Enhance Agriculture Science Lecture and Laboratory Courses at LSUE-A Rural, Two-Year Campus	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Agricultural Sciences);	Jameel Al-Dujaili;	<b>1</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 130,684</b> <b>\$ 130,684</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>014AG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancement of Agriculture Education at LSUS	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Dalton R. Gossett; Stephen W. Banks;	<b>1</b> <b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 14,410</b> <b>\$ 14,410</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					



<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>015AG-07 AGR</b>	Environmental Control System for Lomax Hall Greenhouse Complex	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences);	Peter W. Gallagher; Susan E. Jennings;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 91,845</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 91,845</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>016AG-07 AGR</b>	Rejuvenation of Compacted Pastures and Turfgrass	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences);	Jeff B. Hillard; Charles W. Winstead; Waggoner Russell;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 16,072</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 16,072</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>017AG-07 AGR</b>	Novel Calcium-Sensing for Early Diagnosis of Milk Fever	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences);	Gary A. Kennedy; William H. Green;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 41,334</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 41,334</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

<b>Prop#</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Institution/Department</b>	<b>Principal Investigator(s)</b>	<b>Duration (Years)</b>	<b>BoRSF Money Requested</b>
<b>018AG-07 AGR</b>	The North Louisiana Therapeutic Riding Center Project	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences);	Aleta C. Overby;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 41,643</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 41,643</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>019AG-07 AGR</b>	Louisiana Tech University Meat Science Laboratory Enhancement	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences);	Erin Tucker; Mark W. Murphey;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 124,867</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 124,867</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					
<b>020AG-07 AGR</b>	Enhancement of Farm Equipment for Increased Field Laboratory Experience	Nicholls State University (Agriculture);	Don J. Dufresne; Anne M. Parr; George Toups;	<b>1</b>	<b>\$ 23,721</b>
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 23,721</b>
<b>E</b>					
Proposal is a <b>New Request</b>					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
021AG-07 AGR	Proteomics Analysis of Plant-Microbe Interactions	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	Caryl Chlan; Karl Hasenstein; (Biology);	1	\$ 64,381
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 64,381</b>

E  
Proposal is a **New Request**

022AG-07 AGR	Enhancement of Agricultural Lecture and Laboratory Classes at the University of Louisiana at Monroe	University of Louisiana at Monroe	Joe Pankey; Naveen Musunuru; (Agriculture);	1	\$ 49,815
				<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 49,815</b>

E  
Proposal is a **New Request**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Agricultural Sciences 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
22	\$ 2,056,489	\$ 2,106,445	\$

# 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: \_\_\_\_\_