

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN MATHEMATICS
FY 2013-14**

February 16, 2014

Prepared by:

**William C. Bauldry (Chair)
Appalachian State University**

**Douglas B. Meade
University of South Carolina**

2013-14 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

MATHEMATICS

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. William C. Bauldry, chair, Appalachian State University, and Dr. Douglas B. Meade, University of South Carolina, met via phone and email several times between January 25, 2014, and February 16, 2014, for the purpose of evaluating twelve (12) mathematics proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the review period: a) twelve (12) mathematics proposals to be evaluated with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2013-14 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2010-11 Traditional Enhancement Report in Mathematics.

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

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. The panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 70. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of this report.

For several proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations or reviewer recommendations; however, partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a recommended amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$1,175,965 were submitted to the panel, which then recommended first-year awards totaling \$339,059 for four (4) proposals, with an additional \$359,145 recommended for four (4) proposals if additional funds become available.

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	91	10MATH-14	UL-L	\$72,799	\$50,000		
2	90	07MATH-14	NSU	\$124,760	\$103,520		
3	89	06MATH-14	NIC	\$29,605	\$29,605		
4	86	04MATH-14	LSU-BR	\$176,711	\$155,934	\$50,000	\$50,000
TOTALS:				\$403,875	\$339,059	\$50,000	\$50,000

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

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
5	85	05MATH-14	LSU-E	\$240,934	\$129,258		
6	81	12MATH-14	UNO	\$67,291	\$67,291		
7	71	08MATH-14	SU-BR	\$56,532	\$51,393		
8	70	03MATH-14	LSU-BR	\$134,807	\$111,203	\$14,800	\$14,800
TOTALS:				\$499,564	\$359,145	\$14,800	\$14,800

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
9	67	02MATH-14	LSU-BR	\$35,000	\$0	\$35,000	\$0
9	67	11MATH-14	UNO	\$6,300	\$0	\$6,300	\$0
11	58	01MATH-14	Dillard	\$156,450	\$0		
12	NR	09MATH-14	SU-NO	\$74,776	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$272,526	\$0	\$41,300	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01MATH-14

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Mathematics Instructions and Research
[MIRIII]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Frempong-Mireku

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 3 (of 6 points)
 C.2 0 (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 3 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
 B.2 15 (of 21 points)
 B.3 3 (of 5 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 3 (of 5 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 2 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 58 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$156,450
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 proposal requests funds to construct a computer facility that can also be used for video conferencing. The equipment request is well thought out, though expensive. The software request, however, lacks sufficient detail. It is not clear why both computer algebra systems, Maple and Mathematica, are needed. Available open source software such as Sage could reduce the amount of duplication of functionality with commercial packages. The described project activities for low-level classes are reasonable. However, attempting to insert the instructor's research in a first numerical analysis class is extremely ambitious. It is unclear how actuarial science will be a focus. The project goals are admirable, but assessing success by counting computer usage does not show enhanced learning. Many claims of enhancement are not justified. Connection to prior funding is not clearly stated. The budget justification does not contain adequate explanations of what expenditures are for and why they are needed. The narrative contains numerous grammatical errors, including misspellings and sentence constructions that are difficult to understand. This is surprising, given that it is a resubmission from the last cycle of proposals. It is not clear what the "integrators" (\$5,000) are to train PIs on equipment. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02MATH-14

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Building a Scientific and Professional Network

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lawrence Smolinsky

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 9 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
 B.2 14 (of 20 points)
 B.3 5 (of 8 points)
 B.4 4 (of 8 points)
 B.5 6 (of 8 points)
 B.6 4 (of 8 points)
 B.7 3 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$35,000</u>	<u>\$35,000</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal requests funding for 70 student trips to conferences over two years in order to improve career prospects and graduate enrollment. It is a resubmission from the last competition cycle. It is generally well written, concise, and well documented. However, a number of important details are missing. It is not clear why support for this is not available from the PI's existing NSF/NSA grants. It is not clear what types of conferences the students would attend. How will applications be evaluated for different undergraduate and graduate student groups? How much of an enrollment increase is expected? The project evaluation, a survey completed upon the students' return from conferences, is not appropriate. The PIs should follow up with the students to track employment and graduate school enrollment. Additionally, there is no plan for securing funding for the project once the grant ends, therefore the project appears to be unsustainable. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03MATH-14

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Minority Recruiting and Mentoring in Mathematics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael Tom

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)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
 B.2 13 (of 20 points)
 B.3 5 (of 8 points)
 B.4 6 (of 8 points)
 B.5 6 (of 8 points)
 B.6 5 (of 8 points)
 B.7 2 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	YEAR 1	YEAR 2
			Recommended Amount:
		<u>\$111,203</u>	<u>\$14,800</u>

(if additional funds become available)

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

This proposal to enhance minority recruiting and mentoring has been funded in each of the last two cycles. Each time, the question of sustainability of the project beyond Traditional Enhancement funding has been raised by the panel. While the project has been modestly successful, the PIs need to identify new sources of funding. The budget narrative is confusing and difficult to follow. The funding years are not separated in the descriptions. The request for PIs' salaries, two summer months, appears to be more than what is required or appropriate. It is not clear what the requested \$3,000 for supplies is for. As the goals and objectives are very important, funding is recommended if additional funds become available. However, no funds are recommended for salary support or supplies. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04MATH-14

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The LSU Mathematics Consultation Clinic: Customizing
Technical Tools for Industrial and Academic Applications

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Peter Wolenski

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)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 8 (of 10 points)
 B.2 17 (of 20 points)
 B.3 7 (of 8 points)
 B.4 7 (of 8 points)
 B.5 7 (of 8 points)
 B.6 7 (of 8 points)
 B.7 3 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$176,711</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$155,934</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>

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

This proposal requests funds to initiate a consulting center, rebuild the Applied Mathematics Program lab (AMPlab), and create a new computer lab in concert with the Communicating Across Curriculum (Cx) studio. The project plan is sound and worthy. For the AMPlab, upgrades are requested for equipment and software provided by a previous Enhancement award. However, there are several issues that need clarification. The equipment request for Cx is reasonable, though it is not clear how the equipment and software will be maintained. It is not clear if clients are charged for their use of the Mathematics Consultation Clinic (MCC). Charging a small amount could increase the reputation of the MCC, and could provide an ongoing source of funding beyond the scope of the current proposal. Why is the AIMMS software requested when LSU already holds an academic license (free) for student and faculty use? Why do the PIs need laptop computers for the project? How will student stipends be sustained once the grant is over? The evaluation plan is extremely weak, based solely on student counts. However industry financial support demonstrated in the proposal is very good. Partial funding of \$155,934 is recommended in year one with no funding for PI laptops, AIMMS software, and summer salary. Full funding is recommended in year two. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05MATH-14

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University at Eunice

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Promoting Student Success in Mathematics Using an
Alternative Delivery Method

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Paul Fowler

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 7 (of 8 points)
B.4 7 (of 8 points)
B.5 7 (of 8 points)
B.6 5 (of 8 points)
B.7 4 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No

F. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$240,934
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$129,258

(if additional funds become available)

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

This project to implement an emporium model for developmental instruction is very well designed and shows positive results from a pilot attempt. Scaling the pilot will be a significant challenge for the PIs. The basic problem addressed, improving long-term success of students whose first math course is developmental, is extremely important, particularly for a two-year campus like LSU-Eunice. The explicit data about success rates is particularly convincing. The project plan is thoroughly documented with a good evaluation section that has realistic targets to accomplish. As this request includes funding for establishing a new position, the proposal could be strengthened by a supporting letter from a division director stating the new faculty line will be established and continued after BoRSF funding terminates. The budget includes the design of the new room, including HVAC and electrical, but the amount is only \$4,000. The electrical upgrade and installation are justifiable considering the requested equipment, though the HVAC appears to be a routine upgrade or maintenance issue, which is disallowed in the RFP. Full salaries are requested for a "Coordinator of the Quality Enhancement Plan" and for a tutoring position. The coordinator is not just a mathematics position and the salary request does not appear appropriate. The tutoring position is more appropriate but the RFP stipulates that only 25% of annual salary along with summer support can be requested. Partial funding is recommended if additional funds become available, with no funding for the coordinator position or HVAC installation. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06MATH-14

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing and Enriching the Mathematics Experience for Future Teachers of Mathematics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: DesLey Plaisance

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$29,605
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,605

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 a modest request to provide manipulatives, equipment, and software for enhancing instruction for mathematics education majors by outfitting a designated classroom. A compelling case is made for potential success and significant impact. The work plan is well thought out and easily achievable. A good assessment plan is elucidated. The PIs request a single academic copy of Maple 17 at \$1,245. They should contact MapleSoft to investigate the possibility of increasing their current license by another copy, which may cost much less. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07MATH-14

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Navigating Undergraduate Mathematics Engagement and Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Reeves

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

90

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$124,760
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$103,520

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 to outfit two classrooms with high-end presentation stations and implement a TI-Navigator system for instruction. The proposal is thoroughly detailed and contains a good evaluation plan that will measure the impact of the Navigator system on student learning by analyzing final examination performance. While dissemination via workshops for other institutions is a very good idea, there are concerns with the workshop plan. The workshop is for unidentified faculty from other, unidentified institutions that have no clear engagement with the project, and it is planned long before any success can be analyzed. The budget also appears to contain mathematical errors. Partial funding is recommended, with no funding recommended for the workshop. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08MATH-14

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Mathematics Instruction and Learning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Katrina Cunningham

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 5 (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 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 56 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
 B.2 16 (of 21 points)
 B.3 3 (of 5 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 3 (of 5 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 3 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$56,532

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$51,393

(if additional funds become available)

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

The proposal seeks to upgrade a teaching computer laboratory and a research laboratory for faculty and graduate students. The project will improve connectivity, and the equipment requested is modest and should support the project well. The PIs should be encouraged to consider open source software in addition to MATLAB. The focus of the evaluation plan should be reporting of student grade changes; the raw numbers of students should be secondary. The PIs should note that the abstract should begin with a project description, not a statement of the current situation. Partial funding of \$51,393 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. There is no institutional match.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09MATH-14

INSTITUTION: Southern University at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Statistics Curriculum Using SAS at Southern University at New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Singleton

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 _____ (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 _____ (of 10 points)
 B.2 _____ (of 20 points)
 B.3 _____ (of 8 points)
 B.4 _____ (of 8 points)
 B.5 _____ (of 8 points)
 B.6 _____ (of 8 points)
 B.7 _____ (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No _____

F. Total Score: NR (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$74,776</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal to enhance elementary statistics instruction by expanding computer use and upgrading current facilities might have been competitive if it was submitted correctly. Unfortunately, the narrative was not included, making the proposal impossible to score. Since the project appears to have merit, the PIs should resubmit the full proposal in the next competition in which mathematics is eligible. Based on the budget provided the request is for computers, projectors, desks, and SAS licenses to create a working statistics laboratory. Also included is a request for 10 iPads that was not supported in the budget justification. The request for statistical software is appropriate, but R may be a comparable option that costs nothing. In future submissions, cost figures should be provided as numbers, not in words as was presented in the budget justification. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10MATH-14

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Freshman Mathematics Course to Develop Quantitative Reasoning

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Lopez

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
 B.2 18 (of 20 points)
 B.3 7 (of 8 points)
 B.4 7 (of 8 points)
 B.5 7 (of 8 points)
 B.6 8 (of 8 points)
 B.7 4 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$72,799</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$50,000</u>

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

This proposal requests funds to redesign the basic quantitative reasoning course, build a new Smart classroom, and partially equip a second Smart classroom. The funds will also cover summer salary and travel for the PIs, and stipends for three unnamed mentored faculty members. The PI has received three previous awards from the BoRSF for redesigning courses. The project plan is well designed with a significant evaluation built in. The equipment requested is appropriate to the project. The request for basic supplies such as graph paper and templates seems inappropriate, but the amounts are very small. The main concern noted is the large request for summer support, which appears excessive for revising a single course. The compensation includes summer support for four faculty members, \$1,000 apiece of summer support for three yet-to-be-named faculty members to provide feedback, and funds for 300 hours of work from an undergraduate. The work described could likely be done with approximately half of the support requested. Partial funding of \$50,000 is recommended with reductions to salaries and student support to be made at the discretion of the PI. There was no institutional match. If the support for the unnamed mentored faculty is retained then it will be necessary to provide additional details to the Board of Regents when the contract budget is submitted to confirm the payments conform to program requirements.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11MATH-14

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Statistical Consulting Education at UNO

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tumulesh Solanky

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1 7 (of 10 points)
 B.2 13 (of 20 points)
 B.3 6 (of 8 points)
 B.4 4 (of 8 points)
 B.5 6 (of 8 points)
 B.6 4 (of 8 points)
 B.7 2 (of 4 points)

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

F. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$6,300</u>	<u>\$6,300</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to continue inviting experts to UNO to meet with students and the PIs to enhance statistics instruction and research. While it is an extremely modest request, this proposal marks the fourth time that UNO has submitted this request to the program. With a goal of making the Statistical Consulting class a permanent part of the curriculum, the PIs should have been able to make the class permanent and find a more sustainable sources of funding during the decade of operation. The project evaluation plan is very weak, seeking to evaluate a single class in the statistics program by counting graduates who are employed. Industry support would be better shown by financially underwriting the project, which is achievable given the modest budget. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12MATH-14

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Redesigning Freshman Mathematics Instruction at UNO
Using Technology Based Interactive Teaching Format

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Tumulesh Solanky

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 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 8 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$67,291
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$67,291

(if additional funds become available)

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

The proposal requests funds to equip a computer lab to promote student learning. The plan as described is feasible, and the PIs have completed a pilot course to demonstrate success on a small scale. The PIs also show evidence of attempting to secure ongoing support to keep the project alive after potential BoRSF funding has ended. It is especially noteworthy that the department has been assigned a new faculty line aimed at improving instructional resources and included a technology fee to partially support the facility. The evaluation plan is completely based on student success, which is very good. However, the need for additional laboratories is not justified in the narrative. The integration of the lab into courses, including scheduling, is not clearly established. It is not clear if the PIs intend to have every class meeting in the lab, which has been demonstrated by studies to be less effective than once- or twice-weekly sessions for most mathematics courses. Additionally, placement testing in a local lab delays student scheduling; many institutions have moved to remote online systems for placement. Full funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Mathematics
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001MATH-14	Dr. Peter Frempong-Mireku	Dillard University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Mathematics Instructions and Research [MIRIII]	\$156,450.00	\$0.00	\$156,450.00
002MATH-14	Prof. Lawrence Smolinsky	Louisiana State University and A & M College - Baton Rouge	2 Years	NE	New Request	Building a Scientific and Professional Network	\$35,000.00	\$35,000.00	\$70,000.00
003MATH-14	Prof. Michael Tom	Louisiana State University and A & M College - Baton Rouge	2 Years	NE	Continuation - LEQSF(2011-13)-ENH-TR-09	Minority Recruiting and Mentoring in Mathematics	\$134,807.00	\$14,800.00	\$149,607.00
004MATH-14	Prof. Peter Wolenski	Louisiana State University and A & M College - Baton Rouge	2 Years	NE	New Request	The LSU Mathematics Consultation Clinic: Customizing technical tools for industrial and academic applications	\$176,711.00	\$50,000.00	\$226,711.00
005MATH-14	Dr. Paul Fowler	Louisiana State University at Eunice	1 Year	NE	New Request	Promoting Student Success in Mathematics Using an Alternative Delivery Method	\$240,934.00	\$0.00	\$240,934.00
006MATH-14	Dr. DesLey Plaisance	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancing and Enriching the Mathematics Experience for Future Teachers of Mathematics	\$29,605.00	\$0.00	\$29,605.00
007MATH-14	Dr. Mary Reeves	Northwestern State University	1 Year	E	New Request	Navigating Undergraduate Mathematics Engagement and Learning	\$124,760.00	\$0.00	\$124,760.00
008MATH-14	Dr. Katrina Cunningham	Southern University and A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	New Request	Enhancement of Mathematics Instruction and Learning	\$56,532.00	\$0.00	\$56,532.00
009MATH-14	Dr. Cynthia Singleton	Southern University at New Orleans	1 Year	NE	New Request	Enhancing the Statistics Curriculum Using SAS at Southern University at New Orleans	\$74,776.00	\$0.00	\$74,776.00

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Mathematics
for the FY 2013-14 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/ Continuation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
010MATH-14	Dr. Kathleen Lopez	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	NE	New Request	A Freshman Mathematics Course to Develop Quantitative Reasoning	\$72,799.00	\$0.00	\$72,799.00
011MATH-14	Dr. Tumulesh Solanky	University of New Orleans	2 Years	NE	Continuation - LEQSF(2011-13)-ENH-TR-37	Enhancing Statistical Consulting Education at UNO	\$6,300.00	\$6,300.00	\$12,600.00
012MATH-14	Dr. Tumulesh Solanky	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	New Request	Redesigning Freshman Mathematics Instruction at UNO Using Technology Based Interactive Teaching Format	\$67,291.00	\$0.00	\$67,291.00

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

Total Number of Proposals submitted	12
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,175,965.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$106,100.00
Total Money Requested	\$1,282,065.00

Appendix B

Rating Forms

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

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.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

- YES ____ NO ____
- ____ of 5 pts. A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- ____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points

- ____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- ____ of 21 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 and a schedule of// activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/ 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/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- ____ of 5 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. EQUIPMENT—10 points

- ____ of 6 pts. C.1 To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan activities and the type of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department(s)/units(s)? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- ____ of 1 pt. C.2 Is there a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of the equipment?
- ____ 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?

D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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 college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?

_____ of 10 pts. E.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

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?

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 \$ _____

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

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.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

- YES ____ NO ____
- _____ of 5 pts. A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and department(s)/unit(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s)/unit(s)?

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—66 points

- _____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ 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 and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
- _____ of 8 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/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 8 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)?
- _____ of 8 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 8 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
- _____ of 4 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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, or another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?
- _____ of 10 pts. D.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

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

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

___ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

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: _____