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Introduction

The Social Sciences Review Panel consisting of Dr. John Johannes, Villanova University, Chair, and Dr. John Pauly, Marquette University, communicated via e-mail and phone during March 2015 to evaluate twenty (20) Social Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Traditional Enhancement component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the review: (1) all proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals submitted listing titles, PIs, their institutions, and funds requested; (3) a copy of the most recent Social Sciences report (FY 2011-12); and (4) the FY 2014-15 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel communicated via e-mail and phone to review and rank them. During the review process each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria detailed in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of funding.

The twenty (20) Social Sciences proposals submitted in FY 2014-15 requested a total of $3,092,754 in first-year funds. Six (6) proposals were highly recommended for funding, two (2) of them at reduced levels.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding, together with the recommended funding levels. Table II contains a list of proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available. Table III contains a list of proposals not recommended for funding. 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>05SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$102,811</td>
<td>$102,811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13SS-15</td>
<td>Loyola</td>
<td>$194,692</td>
<td>$186,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>08SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$76,413</td>
<td>$76,413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>03SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$118,664</td>
<td>$118,664</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>07SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$195,438</td>
<td>$172,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14SS-15</td>
<td>SLU</td>
<td>$84,704</td>
<td>$84,704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$772,722</strong></td>
<td><strong>$741,602</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,000</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>7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10SS-15</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$186,250</td>
<td>$172,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17SS-15</td>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>$267,637</td>
<td>$107,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$453,887</strong></td>
<td><strong>$279,950</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</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>9</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>06SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$151,448</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>02SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$254,532</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12SS-15</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$114,637</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>01SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$206,251</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16SS-15</td>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>$82,390</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18SS-15</td>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>$190,005</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>04SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$190,860</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11SS-15</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$138,060</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15SS-15</td>
<td>SU-BR</td>
<td>$73,733</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20SS-15</td>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>$223,099</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19SS-15</td>
<td>UL-M</td>
<td>$180,824</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>09SS-15</td>
<td>LSU-A</td>
<td>$60,306</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>$1,866,145</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: 01SS-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Scholarship Lab: Building Digital Humanities and Digital Resources at LSU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gina Costello

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 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

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

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $206,251
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.)

Funding is requested to enhance digitization capabilities at LSU via a new lab housed in the main campus library. A reasonable case is made for the need to deepen digital humanities support. The goals and objectives are rather general. The project is expensive but varied, including equipment acquisition, graduate assistant support, and a conference. The proposal is poorly written with numerous errors. Much of the focus is on the potential of what the new facility would make possible if it were available. The proposal would be improved if it stated specifically what needs to be done and what the impact will be. Direct evidence of substantial demand is lacking, as the proposal notes that the lab's success "will depend in large part on attracting prospective users". The description of impact on students and faculty is vague and based on expectations and assumptions. The importance of the symposium is not made clear. There is heavy reliance on a graduate student. It is not evident why both PC and MAC workstations are essential. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal seeks to acquire an Isotope Ratio Mass Spectrometer for teaching and research. It is an expensive project that, in principle, is worthwhile for a range of reasons. It has potential to make a difference for both faculty members and students. However, the proposal is poorly executed with multiple errors. The work plan focuses on acquiring, installing, and testing the new spectrometer rather than teaching and research outcomes from use of the equipment. Preparing a new course seems a modest objective for the size of the investment. The project evaluation is confusing and not specifically tied to project goals. This is an all-or-nothing request for an expensive piece of equipment with a somewhat specific, narrow use. The institutional match is not substantive. Funding is not recommended.
### A. The Current Situation

**A.1** Yes \( \times \) No

**A.2** 5 (of 5 points)

**A.3** 5 (of 5 points)

### B. The Enhancement Plan

**B.1** 9 (of 10 points)

**B.2** 20 (of 21 points)

**B.3** 5 (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

**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

**E.1** 2 (of 2 points)

**E.2a** 9 (For S/E)

or

**E.2b** (For NS/NE)

### D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

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

### F. Previous Support Fund Awards

**F.1** Yes \( \times \) No

### G. Total Score:

93 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $118,664

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:** $118,664

**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 equipment to upgrade and expand geographic data services provided by the Department of Geography and Anthropology and the Stephenson Disaster Management Institute. Storage for geographic datasets would be improved and made accessible to students, faculty and the public. The proposal fits nicely with existing equipment and projects. The hardware being replaced and/or upgraded is either near the end of its lifespan or can no longer meet demand. The impact goes beyond departmental teaching and research to serve industry, government, and other universities. The work plan focused somewhat narrowly on the acquisition, installation, and testing of the new equipment rather than on the work to be done with the equipment. The assessment measures lack rigor. However, this is a worthy project and full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04SS-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of a Shallow Water Sonar System to Enhance Riverine and Coastal Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kory Konsoer

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 18 (of 21 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (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 11 (of 12 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 7 (For NS/NE)
E.2b 7 (of 10 points)

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

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

YEAR 1 YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $190,860 $0
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0 $0

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

The Department of Geography and Anthropology seeks to acquire a shallow water multibeam sonar system to enhance riverine and coastal research and education. While the technical details are clear enough, the proposal would benefit from a more general explanation of the project’s importance. The project goals primarily seem to involve deploying and testing the equipment and teaching students to use it. It is not clear what sort of research the equipment will make possible or what sorts of questions it will help researchers address. For undergraduates, there are simulation modules that could at least introduce students to the technology and approaches. The project is interesting but the case for its significance and potential impact is not as compelling as competing proposals. Funding is not recommended.
A six-member team from the Department of Psychology seeks to enhance the EEG Neuroscience laboratory for research and education. The request includes upgrading the current 32-channel system to 64, an EEG/ERP training course, and two EyeLink 1000 Plus systems with software and supplies. The rationale is clear and the need is established. The work plan contains multiple activities but they are well described and sensibly integrated. The equipment and proposed training would provide distinct value to both students and faculty in the department. The argument that undergraduates would receive much benefit from the new equipment in not wholly persuasive. The statement of measurable intellectual outcomes lacks sufficient details. However, the proposal is well written overall and full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06SS-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High Resolution 3D Scanning in Archaeology: Expansion of the LSU Digital Imaging and Visualization in Archaeology [DIVA] Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather McKillop

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 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (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 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 7 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G. Total Score: 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $151,448
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 Department of Geography and Anthropology's DIVA lab seeks a 3D scanning system for research and education. The proposal is reasonable, though often redundant. It is certainly an advantage to have the best available equipment and to expand grant opportunities for faculty and job prospects for students. However, the specific advantages of the upgrade are not clearly stated. No evidence is presented that this will attract more or better graduate students. The evaluation section is weak, as is the argument for economic development. Aside from the ability to analyze teeth and bones more effectively, is the main benefit of the system the clarity of digital presentation? Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER:  07SS-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product Development Using CAD System and Fabric Printer

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lisa McRoberts

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (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)

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

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 1 (For S/E)
or 9 (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: 92 (of 100 points)

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

YEAR 1 YEAR 2

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $195,438 $18,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $172,118 $18,000

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 Textiles, Apparel Design, and Merchandising seeks to upgrade the Computer-aided Design laboratory. The rationale is clear and the impact on resources is well described. The requested equipment builds upon a clear departmental strength. A strong case is made for the importance of apparel education to the Louisiana economy. Project goals, as written, focus on steps to be taken to obtain and install equipment rather than creative objectives for equipment use. The description of impact on the curriculum lacks sufficient details. The assessment plan is vague. However, it is a worthwhile proposal and partial funding in year one of $172,118 with full funding in year two is recommended. Funding is not recommended for installation, though further reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match, which is minimal, may be reduced proportionately.
This proposal seeks to enhance undergraduate learning in physical geography courses by establishing a laboratory for teaching meteorological and hydrologic concepts. The proposal is generally well written with clear goals and objectives. The requested equipment will provide valuable experience with data monitoring and analysis for students. The evaluation component should be more rigorous and a plan for safe storage of equipment is not clearly established. However, the project will provide an important enhancement to the department and full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09SS-15

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University-Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement Plan to the Mac Lab and Media Resources for the Bachelor of Arts in Communication Studies at Louisiana State University at Alexandria [LSUA]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Min Wu

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 3 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 10 points)
B.2 13 (of 21 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 5 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 1 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 2 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 6 (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 3 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 43 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $60,306
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 acquire iPad tablets and statistical analysis software for research and instruction in communications courses. The uses of the equipment being requested appear mundane. Although there may be a need for better equipment, sufficient detail is lacking on the distinctive experiences that new equipment would make possible for students and faculty. Details and concrete examples are not provided to establish that the iPad tablets are needed for teaching data analysis, news editing, and professional social media use. It is not clear what the software will be used for or why it was chosen over less expensive statistical packages. It is not established how the cost of the licenses will be covered after the first year. The proposal contains a number of claims with no substantiating evidence. The assessment plan is inadequate. The institutional match is commendable. No funding is recommended.
### A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4</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>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>20</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>2</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>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

### SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Requested Amount:</th>
<th>Recommended Amount:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td>$186,250</td>
<td>$172,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(if additional funds become available)

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

The School of Design seeks to upgrade its digital fabrication and prototyping facilities with a Robotic Milling Cell. The proposal makes a good case for how the new robotic equipment would fit with and enhance the program's current equipment. Details are lacking on the specific differences in the quality of the products created with the new equipment. The impact on student learning is not clear. The work plan is not thorough, leaving questions to be asked. The proposal is missing the section describing the evaluation plan. The institutional match is commendable. If additional funds become available, partial funding of $172,500 in year one is recommended. Reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI and the institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11SS-15

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Fashion From High School to College to Career: Enhancing Programs Through Expanded Collaborative Learning Environment

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)

| B.1 | 8   | (of 10 points) |
| B.2 | 17  | (of 21 points) |
| B.3 | 4   | (of 5 points)  |
| B.4 | 3   | (of 5 points)  |
| B.5 | 4   | (of 5 points)  |
| B.6 | 3   | (of 5 points)  |
| B.7 | 2   | (of 5 points)  |

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

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

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

| E.1 | 1   | (of 2 points) |
| E.2a|     | (For S/E)     |
| or  |     | (of 10 points) |
| E.2b| 4   | (For NS/NE)   |

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

| G.1 | Yes | x | No |

G. Total Score: 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $138,060

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 enhance the Fashion Merchandising and Retail Studies program by expanding the learning environment. It is well intentioned and to be commended for working with high schools. However, no solid evidence is presented that high schools would participate besides a survey of teachers. There are no letters of support or commitment. The goals and objectives are general and unfocused. The connection between the requested equipment and the outreach and recruitment activities should have been much more strongly articulated. It is not clear if the new equipment is central to cooperation with high schools. It is surprising that the curriculum was changed to depend on this new equipment before the equipment is available. The outreach program to high schools should be well under development rather than a project goal. The actual content of the new program is not defined. The digitizing museum component of the proposal does not appear essential. Assessment of the project is weak. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Virtual Desktop Infrastructure for Advanced Statistical Analysis for Enhanced Research and Instruction in the Department of Psychology and Behavioral Science at Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mary Livingston

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 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (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 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 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 8 (For S/E)
or 8 (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

YEAR 1 YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Amount: $114,637 $0
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0 $0

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

The Department of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences seeks advanced statistical analysis software via virtual desktop infrastructure (VDI) technology to expand the research capabilities of students and faculty. The possibility that this VDI program would lead to campus-wide opportunities is notable. Substantive institutional matching and support are provided. This is a sensible proposal overall, though the case for strong need is not made convincingly. The projected uses for the software are not particularly distinctive. It is not clear how the I/O doctoral program was approved without adequate statistical software for its students. The focus of the proposal appears to be on the technology as a campus innovation rather than on the innovative forms of learning and research that it might enable. The claim is made that this technology will help retain and attract students, but there is no evidence offered. Funding is not recommended.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**INSTITUTION:** Loyola University New Orleans  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Digital Data and Production Infrastructure for Journalism and Strategic Communications Capstone  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Robert Racine

<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 10 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 20 (of 21 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 5 (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 6 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>D.1 12 (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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (of 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Total Score: (of 100 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $194,692  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** $186,892

**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 School of Mass Communications requests a shared storage system, a capstone production system, and a focus group analysis system to enhance audiovisual education. It is a worthy proposal, well presented and exceptionally clear. The equipment request is well aligned with the need for digital sophistication in communication students. The content management system being requested is similar to the one currently used by modern media organizations. The project goals tend to focus upon the steps for acquiring and installing the equipment and more details could be provided on the pedagogical goals and objectives to be achieved. The requested equipment will clearly impact communications curricula. The evaluation section lacks rigor. Partial funding of $186,892 is recommended with no funding recommended for shipping, installation, and the storage racks. The institutional match for equipment and salaries should be maintained in full, though indirect costs may be reduced proportionately.
INSTITUTION: Southeastern Louisiana University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Project I-PAL: An Interactive Physical Activity Lab Designed to Bring Real World Experiences to the Classroom and Support Healthy Development Among Louisiana's Children and Youth

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Holly Kihm

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (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 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 8 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $84,704
RECOMMENDATIONS: $84,704

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 Family and Consumer Sciences program seeks to create a classroom space that will accommodate digital health technology and fitness equipment developed specifically for children and adolescents. This proposal has energy, clarity, and sense of community engagement. The equipment request is specifically tied to a Louisiana social problem, creates a local partnership with the Pennington Biomedical Research Center, and expands research and educational opportunities for faculty and students. The pace of the work plan is brisk, although doable. The discussion with other departments across the University about using the interactive classroom should have been done long before submitting the proposal. Details are lacking for how students will acquire research skills needed to make full use of the lab. However, the project is worthwhile and full funding is recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 15SS-15

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Establishing a Population Research Center That Enhances Social Science Research and Development

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Riad Yehya

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 2 (of 5 points)
A.3 3 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 8 (of 10 points)
B.2 17 (of 21 points)
B.3 1 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

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

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 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a 4 (For S/E)
or 4 (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 65 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $73,733
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 establish a Population Research Center for social sciences research. This is a straightforward equipment replacement request formatted in the context of a research lab. The need for the upgrade is clear. However, it is not made evident why all the requested machines must be fully outfitted with SPSS and other software. The gap between having outmoded and unreliable computers and creating a new center is large and unlikely to be overcome by the installation of new computers. The proposal is poorly written in places. The evaluation and assessment plan lacks rigor, though the assessment of social sciences research classes is not easy. Funding is not recommended.
**Certificate in Family Practice: A Program to Enhance Graduate Education and Community Capacity**

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Richard Ager

**A. The Current Situation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B.1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>(of 10 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(of 4 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

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

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

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

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

|   | F.1 | Yes | x | No |

**F. Total Score:** 81 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUEST:** Requested Amount: $82,390

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: $0

**COMMENTS:**

The Tulane School of Social Work seeks to develop and implement a Certificate in Family Practice program for field instructors and professors who teach counseling to graduate students. The program will be delivered via two four-day workshops by regional and national experts on current evidence-based practices. This is a proposal to train the trainers, linking to other initiatives in the school. The endeavor itself is worthwhile and may prove extremely valuable. However, it is not made evident how successful current similar programs are, and the projected results are not supported with sufficient details. The work plan makes sense, but it is not clear why much of the work was not done before submission. There is no indication who the workshop instructors would be. There is a high degree of supposition, such as planning on 50 clinicians and the willingness of faculty to attend two full four-day sessions and another 250 to attend the sessions in part. The notion that these workshops would catapult the school into eminence by demonstrating a new model seems overstated, as is the claim that this will attract higher-quality students. Funding is not recommended.
The proposal seeks to establish a facility for teaching digital media production. The proposal focuses upon an area of distinction for Tulane and the New Orleans area. The project title specifically cites colorization though the stated rationale is to improve post-production capabilities in general. It is a solid and sensible project that would enhance student learning. The impact on faculty is not made clear. The argument that the facility would attract better students lacks evidence. The assessment plan lacks rigor. The request is sizable relative to available funds, and no match is provided for equipment. If funds become available, partial funding of $107,450 is recommended for one camera and a lab with a reduced number of stations. Further reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI and the institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
INSTITUTION: Tulane University
TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Field and Laboratory Research: Enhancement of the Center for Archaeology [CFA], Department of Anthropology, Tulane University
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jason Nesbitt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 56 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No</td>
<td>B.1 9 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 17 (of 21 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Equipment</td>
<td>B.5 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>B.6 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 6 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>B.7 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 3 (of 3 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact |
| (Total of 12 Points) |
| E.1 0 (of 2 points)   |
| E.2a (For S/E)        |
| or (of 10 points)     |
| E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)    |

| 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: $190,005
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.)

Tulane's Department of Anthropology seeks to expand the capacity of the Center for Archaeology by equipping three new integrated laboratories. The proposal is often redundant and poorly written in some sections. The program has not been able to keep up with technological changes in the practice of archaeology, which is a reasonable rationale for the request. However, it was not completely clear why this specific combination of facilities is the best means of improvement. The project goals are clear, comprehensive, and persuasive, though the work plan is not very precise. The assessment plan is vague and generic. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: WILLS - Warhawk Interactive Learning Library Spaces

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Robertson

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 10 points)
B.2 12 (of 21 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)
B.6 1 (of 5 points)
B.7 0 (of 5 points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 7 (of 12 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
E.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 49 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $180,824
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 expand library services with student work spaces, technology resources and faculty professional development. The proposal is sensible and the equipment needed. Installing group study spaces in the library for active learning is a worthy endeavor and increasingly common in academic libraries. However, the stated rationale lacks specific details. It is not made clear how the creation of the rooms will foster the learning practices envisioned for the rooms. It is not evident why each room needs a separate control panel for scheduling room use. The specific amounts and types of equipment are not well justified. It is not evident why all the rooms must be fully equipped or if all the technology will be used in all rooms most of the time. The faculty training portion is very ambiguous: what training, by whom, for what, and with what demonstrable outcomes? Pedagogy and use of the library rooms are not necessarily linked. Instituting the flipped classroom is not inherently linked to library study rooms, though this case could have been made. There is no plan for effective assessment other than observing that the equipment is in place. The institutional match is impressive; however, funding is not recommended.
This proposal seeks to redesign three general use laboratories to serve as the Milneburg Hall Social Science Resource Center. The writing is often awkward and contains errors. The enhancement plan is vague, as is the description of precisely which students will be helped and what expectations there will be. Locating the labs in a newly configured building makes sense. The proposed activities are rather loosely bundled. Ideally, the whole should have a value beyond the sum of the parts, and the different activities in this proposal tend to stand alone, without much relation to each other. The connection between the objectives and hardware and software is not as clear as it should be. It is not evident why all three labs need, on an equal basis and at the same time, the upgrades rather than an incremental approach. The assessment section is weak and should include more than measures of usage. The institutional match is notable. However, funding is not 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>New/Continuation</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001SS-15</td>
<td>Mrs. Gina Costello</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Digital Scholarship Lab; Building Digital Humanities and Digital Resources at LSU</td>
<td>$206,251.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Kristine DeLong</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Stable Isotope Mass Spectrometer for Teaching and Research in Geography and Anthropology</td>
<td>$254,532.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003SS-15</td>
<td>Mr. Luke Driskell</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Web-enabled Geodata and Computing Platform</td>
<td>$118,664.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Kory Konsoer</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Acquisition of a shallow water sonar system to enhance riverine and coastal research and education</td>
<td>$190,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Sean Lane</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Psychology Department EEG Neuroscience Lab</td>
<td>$102,811.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Heather McKillop</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>High Resolution 3D Scanning in Archaeology; Expansion of the LSU Digital Imaging and Visualization in Archaeology [DIVA] Lab</td>
<td>$151,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007SS-15</td>
<td>Prof. Lisa McRoberts</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Enhancing and Expanding Digital Apparel Product Development Using CAD System and Fabric Printer</td>
<td>$195,438.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Jill Trepanier</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Physical Geography Laboratory; Connecting Students with the Earth</td>
<td>$76,413.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Min Wu</td>
<td>Louisiana State University at Alexandria</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Enhancement Plan to the Mac Lab and Media Resources for the Bachelor of Arts in Communication Studies at Louisiana State University at Alexandria [LSUA]</td>
<td>$60,306.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010SS-15</td>
<td>Mr. Brad Deal</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Digital Fabrication Enhancement via Robotic Milling Cell</td>
<td>$186,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Kathleen Heiden</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Fashion From High School to Career: Enhancing Programs Through Expanded Collaborative Learning Environment</td>
<td>$138,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Livingston</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Virtual Desktop Infrastructure for Advanced Statistical Analysis for Enhanced Research and Instruction in the Department of Psychology and Behavioral Science at Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>$114,637.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Social Sciences
#### for the FY 2014-15 Review Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Equipment/Non Equipment</th>
<th>New/Continuation</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>013SS-15</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Racine</td>
<td>Loyola University New Orleans</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Digital Data and Production Infrastructure for Journalism and Strategic Communications Capstone</td>
<td>$194,692.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Holly Kihm</td>
<td>Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Project I-PAL: An interactive physical activity lab designed to bring real world experiences to the classroom and support healthy development among Louisiana’s children and youth</td>
<td>$84,704.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Riad Yehya</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Establishing a Population Research Center That Enhances Social Science Research and Development</td>
<td>$73,733.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. Richard Ager</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Certificate in Family Practice: A Program to Enhance Graduate Education and Community Capacity</td>
<td>$82,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017SS-15</td>
<td>Dr. MRY BLUE</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Learning the Language of Color in the Digital Film Production Process</td>
<td>$267,637.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018SS-15</td>
<td>Prof. Jason Nesbitt</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Integrating Field and Laboratory Research: Enhancement of the Center for Archaeology [CFA], Department of Anthropology, Tulane University</td>
<td>$190,005.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019SS-15</td>
<td>Ms. Cynthia Robertson</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>WILLS - Warhawk Interactive Learning Library Spaces</td>
<td>$180,824.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020SS-15</td>
<td>Mr. Anthony Cipolone</td>
<td>University of New Orleans</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Milneburg Hall Social Science Resource Center</td>
<td>$223,099.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number of Proposals submitted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Money Requested for First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,092,754.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Money Requested for Second Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Money Requested</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,110,754.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Rating Forms
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, if 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 66 points

____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?

____ of 23 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 6 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?

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?
Proposal Number: ____________________________  Principal Investigator: ____________________________  Page 2 of 3

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. 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:

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

___ of 100 points

Proposal Number: ____________________________  Principal Investigator: ____________________________  Page 3 of 3

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount: $__________________________  Recommended Amount: $__________________________

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________________________

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: ____________________________________________________________

Reviewer's Signature: ________________________________________________________________ Date: ____________________________

(Form 6.12, rev.2010)
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11

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 criteria 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 56 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 18 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 6 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 whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?
C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

_____ of 6 pts.  C.1  To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?

_____ of 1 pt.  C.2  Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?

_____ of 3 pts.  C.3  To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:
F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS—No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount $______________  Recommended Amount $______________

COMMENTS:

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 2010)