FY 2016-17 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

MATHEMATICS

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. Hema Srinivasan, University of Missouri, chair; and Dr. Sung Lee, University of Southern Mississippi, communicated via phone and email during February and March of 2017 for the purpose of evaluating ten (10) proposals submitted under the Mathematics discipline 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: a) ten (10) Mathematics proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2016-17 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) the FY 2013-14 Traditional Enhancement Report in Mathematics.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the ten (10) proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

First-year requests totaling $918,063 were received by the panel, which then recommended first-year awards totaling $217,112 for four (4) proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels, and Table II lists one proposal recommended if additional funds become available. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. 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 attached at the end of the report.
### TABLE I
**PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10MATH-17</td>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>$54,112</td>
<td>$54,112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>09MATH-17</td>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>$62,478</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$47,478</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>05MATH-17</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$99,190</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>08MATH-17</td>
<td>SUNO</td>
<td>$91,533</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$307,313</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,112</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,478</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>04MATH-17</td>
<td>LSUAM</td>
<td>$150,022</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>03MATH-17</td>
<td>LSUAM</td>
<td>$125,725</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>06MATH-17</td>
<td>NTCC</td>
<td>$183,933</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>01MATH-17</td>
<td>FTCC</td>
<td>$28,433</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>07MATH-17</td>
<td>SUNO</td>
<td>$9,264</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>02MATH-17</td>
<td>GSU</td>
<td>$113,373</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$335,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 01MATH-17

INSTITUTION: Fletcher Technical Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding and Enhancing Technology in the Mathematics Classrooms

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Terry Authement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes X No</td>
<td>B.1 6 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 17 (of 21 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 5 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1 4 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>D.1 8 (of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 3 (of 3 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)</th>
<th>F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>G.1 Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $28,433
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

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

This proposal seeks to upgrade a computer lab to enhance Mathematics instruction. The writing could be stronger in several places. The rationale for the project and the methodology should be improved. The proposal plan is not well thought out, though the evaluation component is strong and the budget is reasonable. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02MATH-17

INSTITUTION: Grambling State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mathematical Modeling of Infectious Diseases

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Bassidy Dembele

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 66 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes</td>
<td>B.1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>B.2 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>B.3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>B.4 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise</td>
<td>B.5 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>B.6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(of 4 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

E. Previous Support Fund Awards

(Final of 12 Points)

(D of 2 points)

D.2a 2

or

D.2b 8

(For NS/NE)

F. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY

REQUESTED AMOUNT: $113,373

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

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

This proposal seeks to introduce into instruction modeling techniques for the spread of infectious disease. The initial thrust is a worthwhile idea. The proposal could be improved by providing examples of projects that the undergraduate students will work on and a detailed plan for project evaluation. It is not clear whether the focus of this project is training students with mathematical modeling or MATLAB. There is an open source software package called Octave which is available for free and is compatible with MATLAB. This might be preferable to spending $12,000 for a commercial software package. A high percentage of the request is for salary. The goals of the project could be accomplished with less funding. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03MATH-17

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Capacity Development in Mathematical Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Frank Neubrander

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)
B.1 9 (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 2 (of 4 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
D.2b (For NS/NE)
8

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 RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $125,725
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 Department of Mathematics at LSU seeks to host professional development workshops for K-12 teachers in order to improve incoming undergraduates. This is a well-written proposal by well-qualified PIs. The goals and benefits are well articulated and the work plan is highly detailed and compelling. However, the specific enhancement appears to be geared towards K-12 teachers, which falls outside the scope of the Traditional Enhancement Program. The requested funds would mainly cover stipends for K-12 teachers, which is not allowable in the RFP, and faculty salary, which is discouraged by the RFP. Funding is not recommended.
The Department of Mathematics seeks to enhance the impact of the Mathematics Consultation Center. The value of the Center and the long-term impact of the project on instruction are clearly presented. The PIs are well qualified to achieve the goals and appear to have had success in previous projects. The budget is high and a sizable amount of salary is requested. Partial funding of $100,000 is recommended for year one and no funding is recommended for year two if additional funds become available. Reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05MATH-17

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Sophomore Mathematics Experience and More

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Matthew Gamel

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
   (Total of 56 Points)
   B.1 9 (of 10 points)
   B.2 18 (of 21 points)
   B.3 4 (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)

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

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

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

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: $99,190
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $85,000

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

The Department of Mathematics seeks to improve infrastructure for sophomore undergraduates. Two classrooms will be upgraded, one to enhance collaborative learning and one to serve as more of a computer lab. The proposal is reasonably argued, the need is well established and the impact is clear. Partial funding of $85,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match is minimal and may be reduced proportionately.
A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 14 (of 21 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 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)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
E.2b 6 (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $183,933
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $0

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

This proposal seeks to enhance Mathematics instruction. A strong argument is made for reforming the math curriculum. The needs statement, conceptual plan and project rationale are very compelling. The K-12 outreach is a positive. Unfortunately, the proposal does not follow through with specific measurable objectives and student learning outcomes, and the proposed evaluation measures are vague. While individual equipment requests may be justified, the total amount requested is unrealistic. It is not clear how the team intends to sustain the program beyond the life of the project. Outside facilitators would be paid $40,000 to run the project for the year. The project should be redesigned with a clear methodology, significantly lower budget, and plan for sustainability. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal seeks to improve student learning in Mathematics. The writing needs significant improvement. The argument for need is not connected to the goals of the project. Evidence is lacking that the proposed activities will benefit students. The impact on education is unclear. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal seeks to enhance curriculum and instructional technology. Institutional licenses for SAS are very expensive. We recommend that they consider using free open source alternative R which is also compatible with SAS. In addition, using an open source alternative to Mathematica, for example Sage, may bring down their cost. Funding at a reduced budget is recommended.

This proposal seeks to enhance the Mathematics curriculum with instructional technology and software. It is well written overall. The goals are strong and a convincing argument is made for impact. The ideas are not innovative but are proven. The requested institutional licenses for SAS are expensive. The PI should consider using the free, open source alternative "R" which is also compatible with SAS. In addition, using an open source alternative to Mathematica, such as Sage, may bring down costs. Partial funding of $46,000 is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
This proposal seeks to enhance research in algebraic combinatorics. It is well written and the program is worthwhile. The goals are strong and sensible. The impact is clearly established. The requested release time from teaching for the graduate student is not compelling. The student would be better served with the teaching experience and the panel does not support this. The support for travel, however, is acceptable. Partial funding of $32,000 in year one and $30,000 in year two is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10MATH-17

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)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 56 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(of 10 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(of 12 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $54,112

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $54,112

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

This proposal seeks to provide a computer teaching lab to address critical needs for Mathematics instruction. The writing is excellent. The ideas presented are not innovative, but they are proven. The goals are very realistic and the budget is well thought out and modest. The department is clearly invested in the program. The team has a proven record. Full funding is recommended.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Equipment/Non Equipment</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001MATH-17</td>
<td>Mr. Terry Authement</td>
<td>Fletcher Technical Community College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Expanding and Enhancing Technology in the Mathematics Classrooms</td>
<td>$28,433.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. Bassidy Dembele</td>
<td>Grambling State University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Mathematical Modeling of Infectious Diseases</td>
<td>$113,373.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003MATH-17</td>
<td>Prof. Frank Neubrander</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Capacity Development in Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>$125,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004MATH-17</td>
<td>Prof. Peter Wolenski</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>The Systematic Development of the Math Consultation Clinic</td>
<td>$150,022.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. Matthew Gamel</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Enhancing the Sophomore Mathematics Experience and More</td>
<td>$99,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006MATH-17</td>
<td>Mrs. Beth Alford</td>
<td>Northshore Technical Community College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Close the STEM Gap</td>
<td>$183,933.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. zheng chen</td>
<td>Southern University at New Orleans</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Assisting SUNO students with learning college mathematics well through a series of workshops and one math fair</td>
<td>$9,264.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. Cynthia Singleton</td>
<td>Southern University at New Orleans</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SUNO: Improving the Mathematics Multimedia Classroom</td>
<td>$91,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. Tai Ha</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Enhance Research in Algebraic Combinatorics</td>
<td>$109,956.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010MATH-17</td>
<td>Dr. Tumulesh Solanky</td>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Redesigning Freshman Mathematics Instruction at UNO Using Technology Based Interactive Teaching Format</td>
<td>$54,112.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Proposals submitted: 10
Total Money Requested for First Year: $918,063.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year: $97,478.00
Total Money Requested: $1,015,541.00
Appendix B

Rating Forms
A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

YES ____ NO ____ 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: ____________________________ (Form 6.11, rev 2015)
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 _____ 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 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: ____________ (Form 6.12, rev 2015)