

2006-07 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

Earth and Environmental Sciences

INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett, Chair, University of Arizona; and Dr. Kevin Mickus, Missouri State University met in Baton Rouge on March 29-30, 2007, for the purpose of evaluating twenty (20) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) twenty (20) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2006-07 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of the 2004 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the twenty 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.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 80. 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.

For many proposals in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations; however, the partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$2,091,246 were submitted to the Health and Medical Sciences review panel. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$852,603.

TABLE I**EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES****PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	91	010EAR-07	LSU-S	\$30,400	\$30,400
2	85	017EAR-07	ULL	\$59,000	\$59,000
3	84	011EAR-07	LA TECH	\$78,346	\$78,346
3	84	020EAR-07	ULM	\$86,111	\$86,111
5	83	001EAR-07	CENTENARY	\$108,880	\$108,880
6	82	002EAR-07	DILLARD	\$70,191	\$59,890
6	82	006EAR-07	LSU-BR	\$54,930	\$29,800
6	82	009EAR-07	LSU-S	\$25,691	\$25,691
6	82	014EAR-07	SU-BR	\$133,385	\$133,385
10	81	005EAR-07	LSU-BR	\$150,409	\$130,100
11	80	012EAR-07	NICHOLLS	\$167,310	\$111,000
TOTAL				\$964,653	\$852,603

TABLE II

EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

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

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
12	78	004EAR-07	LSU-BR	\$112,430	\$112,430
TOTAL				\$112,430	\$112,430

TABLE III

EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
13	77	018EAR-07	ULL	\$154,285	\$0	\$0	\$0
14	73	007EAR-07	LSU-BR	\$213,250	\$0	\$0	\$0
15	72	019EAR-07	ULM	\$73,800	\$0	\$0	\$0
16	67	013EAR-07	NUNEZ	\$164,253	\$0	\$0	\$0
17	65	003EAR-07	LSU-AG	\$111,375	\$0	\$0	\$0
18	59	015EAR-07	SUBR	\$145,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
19	57	008EAR-07	LSU-E	\$110,200	\$0	\$0	\$0
20	52	016EAR-07	SUBR	\$42,000	\$0	\$54,000	\$0
TOTAL				\$1,014,163	\$0	\$54,000	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition and Integration of a Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) from Introductory Courses up to Senior Research Projects in Support of the Enhancement of Interdisciplinary Experience

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

83

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$108,880
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$108,880

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

The proposal is a request to obtain a Scanning Electronic Microscope machine at Centenary College to be shared between the Geology and Chemistry departments. The Principal Investigators are moderately published and cited by peers. The panel is impressed with the level of matching funds, both in cash from the institution and from a large NASA grant to Centenary College for science education. While the proposal heavily emphasizes an educational role for the facility, the panel assumes that the equipment will be used in research as well. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Environmental Science Education (ESSE) Phase II

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$70,191</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$59,890</u>

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

This is a proposal to acquire a High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) system and spectral analysis equipment along with computing facilities for Dillard University. The Principal Investigators are moderately published and cited by peers. The panel is impressed by future instructional plans at the school in relationship to its recovery from Hurricane Katrina flooding. However, the panel questions whether the request for three personal computers (PCs) and three projectors is relevant to the science objective of the proposal. The panel recommends funding at a reduced level, and recommends funding for one PC (for support of the analytical equipment) and no funding for projectors. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Enhancement for Environmental Research and Demonstrations of Water Runoff from Urban Settings

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

65

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 14 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$111,375
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 is a proposal to develop lawn plots for chemical studies of runoff at the Callegari Environmental Center. The panel is concerned that the Principal Investigator (PI) does not have external support for the center. The proposal is weak on specifics in every area. It is unclear how many plots the PIs wish to equip. There is no evidence for the impact on student courses. The matching funds are insignificant. The PIs are not well published and the number of external grants are weak. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of an Ion Chromatograph (IC) and High Performance Liquid Chromatograph (HPLC) for Environmental Research and Education

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

78

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$112,430
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$112,430
(If additional funds become available)

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

This is a proposal to acquire High Performance Liquid Chromatograph (HPLC) and ion chromatographic equipment at Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge Oceanography and Coastal Studies Department. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are well published, externally funded and well cited in the literature. While the PIs' research program seems worthwhile, the proposal does not convey a sense of excitement about these programs. The proposal discusses applications in courses but is somewhat unspecific, and the panel questions how the requested equipment would be used in introductory oceanography courses. The panel recommends funding only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Instrumentation Enhancement for Analytical Geochemistry Teaching and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$150,409
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$130,100

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

This is a proposal to acquire High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) system and an Ion Chromatograph (IC) at the Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge Geology and Geophysics Department. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are well published, externally funded and cited in the literature. The panel was impressed with the interesting range of research activities of the three PIs. The proposal is a strong research proposal but does not develop educational goals significantly. This research potential, particularly of the first PI, is the panel's main motivation for recommending this project. The panel recommends funding at a reduced level, with the expenditure at the discretion of the PI. The panel suggests purchasing a less expensive IC machine or possibly acquiring miscellaneous hardware (HPLC columns and other items, listed in the budget as "Supplies") with funds from another source. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrade to Ground Penetrating Radar Field Acquisition System

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$54,930
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$29,800

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

This is a proposal to upgrade a ground penetrating radar system (GPR) and purchase a new monostatic GPR system. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are well published, consistently active, externally funded and well cited in the literature. The panel is impressed with the range of activities in which the equipment will be used. However, the panel was concerned about the 3D applications, as neither the current nor the new equipment would collect data in a true 3D mode. While both collect data in a 2D mode and the data could be put into 3D visualization programs, that does not make the data 3D. It was not clear what frequency antenna the current system has nor what antennae they would obtain. This is critical in determining what depths they would be imaging. There are no matching funds. The panel recommends partial funding, for the upgrade to the current bistatic system only.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Germanium Multi-Array Detector for Enhanced Speciation Measurement

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources This

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

H. Total Score:

73

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$213,250
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 is a proposal to acquire a new detector array and multichannel analyzers for XANES and XAFS studies of ionic speciation. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are well published, well cited, and seem to be consistently productive. In spite of valuable letters of support, both industrial and educational applications appear to be weak. The economic and cultural impacts are not well described. The equipment and techniques, as well as research to date of several participating scientists, are well explained but there is a lack of specifics on future research. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Agricultural and Environmental Biological Terrorism: A Threat to Rural Louisiana Security

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 0 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

57

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$110,200
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 requests equipment for training for agricultural technology and counter-biological terrorism. The institutional description focuses on the local law enforcement and not the institution. The text repeatedly mentions AEBT (agricultural and environmental biological terrorism) in bold letters, but does not focus on the methods of attack, the pathogens that may be used, what responders may be looking for, and how the equipment will aid their activities. Furthermore the equipment described in the body of the proposal (microscopes and classroom media) is totally different from the equipment in the budget section (computer forensic software and hardware). The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Environmental Science Laboratory Curriculum Using Computer Interfaced Equipment

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 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 (of 10 points)
E.2b _____ (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

82

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$25,691
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$25,691

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

This is a proposal to acquire eight sets of class laboratory equipment for water analysis, with an equal number of personal computers, at LSU-Shreveport. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are reasonably well published and cited in the literature. The panel is impressed with the clear description of the educational value of the equipment. The equipment will complement other equipment within the Red River Institute at LSU-Shreveport. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Collection Improvement and Computerization of the LSUS Herbarium

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 22 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No _____

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: \$30,400
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$30,400

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

This is a proposal to digitize herbarium collections at LSU-Shreveport. All the Principal Investigators (PIs) have external grants. The panel is impressed by the matching funds. The PIs asked for exactly what they needed and it is clear what they want to do. The herbarium collection will only be useful for other researchers if the collection is digitized, so the collection must be digitized in the near future. The project will be useful to the Red River Project. The only weakness is that the proposal does not identify the resident student advisor or the manner in which the undergraduates will be supervised. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Aquatic Environmental Science

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

84

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$78,346
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$78,346

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

This is a proposal to acquire a bacteria fermentor and related equipment to develop algicides. The Principal Investigator (PI) is well published and cited with four patents but does not have current external funding. The panel is impressed with the extremely polished presentation of the proposal. The research carries risk but also great importance if successful. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Instrumentation of Environmental Education and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes No X

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

H. Total Score:

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$167,310 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$111,000 </u>

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

This is a proposal to acquire an array of aqueous analysis equipment to study delta processes at Nicholls State University. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are all reasonably well published and cited in the literature, which the panel found impressive at this institution. The panel finds the research on the deltaic environment important, both locally and for the state of Louisiana. The proposal could have benefited from enunciation of future educational and research goals. The institutional description is also weak. There is no institutional match. The panel recommends partial funding, with the reductions to be made at the PI's discretion.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Environmental Science in the Community College

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$164,253
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 is a proposal to obtain a wetland pond and landscaping/garden for the Islenos community in the New Orleans area. An educational wetland pond facility and a commemorative garden are linked creatively in this proposal. However, the proposal does not clearly state what educational and research goals or activities will be pursued in using the pond. While there are significant matching funds, they focus on the commemorative garden and fountain, and the budget suggests that the Support Fund would be funding these items in part. The panel was skeptical that this is within the bounds of the Enhancement Program. There are eleven environmental courses mentioned but their relationship to the pond facility is not clear. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Educational Expansion and Research Enhancement with a
Dispersive X-ray Fluorescence Spectrometer

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$133,385
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$133,385

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

This is a proposal to acquire an XRF machine at Southern University in Baton Rouge. The Principal Investigator (PI) is well published and is cited in the literature. The panel is impressed by the research activities of the PI and other scientists involved, and strongly believes that this facility will result in excellent student training. The proposal is very well-prepared. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015-EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing SUBR's Undergraduate and Graduate Research and Teaching Environment Through Experiential Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

59

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$145,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal asks for a nano-High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) system to integrate into environmental toxicology research facilities at Southern University in Baton Rouge. The Principal Investigator (PI) is relatively well published and supported with National Institute of Health (NIH) grants. The text is well conceived as a whole, but there were a number of typographical errors and vague descriptions. It is clear that another person (other than the PI) will be running the machinery, but a vitae is not given and he/she is not described. Future research plans are unclear. The budget is poorly articulated, difficult to understand, and contains numbers that do not add up to the total. The basic cost of the machine, without additional components, is not clear to the panel. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016EAR-07

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Employability of Urban Forestry Students Through
Experiential Learning

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

G. Total Score: 52 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No X

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$42,000</u>	<u>\$54,000*</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This is a proposal to fund the training of undergraduates in urban forestry field projects at Southern University in Baton Rouge. The panel commends the efforts of the Principal Investigator (PI) in developing motivational research for minorities in her field. However, the proposal is too short on specifics of many kinds. The proposal gives the specialties of the faculty but does not explain what the faculty will do in the project. There is no description of what the actual field projects will be, and what role the students will take. Most budget numbers are rounded figures of thousands, with poor explanations for the purpose of expenditures. The PI is not well published and little information is provided for Co-PIs. The panel does not recommend funding.

***Note: The RFP restricts request for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.**

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Molecular Methods in Oceanographic Research at UL Lafayette

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$59,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$59,000

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.)

This is a proposal to acquire PCR and related research equipment. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are well published, funded and cited in the literature. Although the proposal does not develop educational goals, the panel is impressed by the research need and potential of being able to conduct these analyses on the sea. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Heat Driven Air Conditioning Lab

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$154,285
 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 is a proposal to develop air conditioning systems from waste heat by building a semiscale test system at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette. The Principal Investigators (PIs) seem to have little research activity, with a small number of publications and citations. Educational goals are described, but it was not clear how students in six different courses will conduct varied and meaningful experiments using the equipment. For such a physically large system, the panel would like to see a letter from the university administration to indicate how the system will be accommodated. The panel finds the proposal interesting but feels that it would be more appropriately submitted under an engineering discipline. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Geosciences Satellite Receiving Ground Station: Local Data
Reception for Teaching and Research

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$73,800
 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 is a proposal to acquire a satellite receiving station in ULM instructional activities. The Principal Investigators (PIs) are moderately well published. While the opportunity to acquire and process primary data might be very educational, the panel is concerned that much of the data are available rapidly and widely in a processed form, making the equipment partly redundant. In addition, the panel questions whether the PI will have the time to develop the codes for the processing of raw satellite data. There are no matching funds. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020-EAR-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Laboratory for Instrumentation Visualization Education (LIVE) and
ULM Hurricane Evaluation at Landfall Project for Science
(ULM HELPS)

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$86,111
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$86,111

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

This is a proposal to upgrade and acquire equipment towers to monitor hurricane landfalls. The Principal Investigator (PI) is very clear in his descriptions of the equipment and what he wants to do with it. The work plan articulates the educational applications very clearly, and the educational impact will be strong. Despite concerns that there are no Co-PIs or evidence of technical support and that the PI may not have the time to maintain the equipment, the panel recommends full funding.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001EAR-07 EAR	Acquisition and Integration of a Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM) from Introductory Courses up to Senior Research Projects in Support of the Enhancement of the Interdisciplinary Experience	Centenary College (Geology);	Scott Vetter; Thomas Ticich;	1	\$ 108,880
E				Total	\$ 108,880
Proposal is a New Request					
002EAR-07 EAR	Enhancement of Environmental Science Education (ESSE) Phase II	Dillard University (Chemistry);	Lovell Agwaramgbo; Eric Buckles; Jose rAMIREZ Domenech;	1	\$ 70,191
E				Total	\$ 70,191
Proposal is a New Request					

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

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003EAR-07 EAR	Equipment Enhancement for Environmental Research and Demonstrations of water runoff from urban settings.	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Agricultural Center (W. A. Callegari Environmental Center);	William A. Carney; Javed Iqbal;	1	\$ 111,375
				Total	\$ 111,375
E	Proposal is a New Request				
004EAR-07 EAR	Acquisition of an Ion Chromatograph (IC) and High Performance Liquid Chromatograph (HPLC) for Environmental Research and Education	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Oceanography and Coastal Sciences);	Jaye E. Cable; Charles W. Lindau; Robert P. Gambrell; Sibel B. Ates;	1	\$ 112,430
				Total	\$ 112,430
E	Proposal is a New Request				
005EAR-07 EAR	Instrumentation Enhancement for Analytical Geochemistry Teaching and Research	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Geology);	Annette Summers Engel; Huiming Bao; William Blanford;	1	\$ 150,409
				Total	\$ 150,409
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006EAR-07 EAR	Upgrade to Ground Penetrating Radar Field Acquisition System	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Geology & Geophysics);	Jeffrey A. Nunn; Michael Blum;	1	\$ 54,930
				Total	\$ 54,930
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
007EAR-07 EAR	Germanium Multi -Array Detector for Enhanced Speciation Measurement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Center for Advanced Microstructures and Devices);	Amitava Roy; Josef Hormes;	1	\$ 213,250
				Total	\$ 213,250
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
008EAR-07 EAR	Agricultural and Environmental Biological Terrorism: A Threat to Rural Louisiana Security	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Business and Technology);	Fred N. Landry; Jameel Al-Dujaili; Jan Broussard; Michael Axelrod; Steven Gervais;	1	\$ 110,200
				Total	\$ 110,200
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009EAR-07 EAR	Enhancement of the Environmental Science Laboratory Curriculum Using Computer Interfaced Equipment	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Stephen W. Banks; Dalton R. Gossett;	1	\$ 25,691
				Total	\$ 25,691
E	Proposal is a New Request				
010EAR-07 EAR	Collection Improvement and Computerization of the LSUS Herbarium	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (LSUS Herbarium);	Michael H. MacRoberts; Gary M. Hanson; M. Cran Lucas; Nathan R. Hutchings;	1	\$ 30,400
				Total	\$ 30,400
N	Proposal is a New Request				
011EAR-07 EAR	Enhancement of Aquatic Environmental Science	Louisiana Tech University (Biological Sciences);	Harrell L. Walker;	1	\$ 78,346
				Total	\$ 78,346
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012EAR-07 EAR	Enhancing Instrumentation of Environmental Education and Research	Nicholls State University (Biological Sciences);	Enmin Zou; Gary J. LaFleur; Raj Boopathy;	1	\$ 167,310
				Total	\$ 167,310
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
013EAR-07 EAR	Enhancing Environmental Science in the Community College	Nunez Community College (Allied Health and Natural Science);	Stephen Waddell; Klaus Heyer;	1	\$ 164,253
				Total	\$ 164,253
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
014EAR-07 EAR	Educational Expansion and Research Enhancement with a Dispersive X-ray Fluorescence Spectrometer	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Environmental Toxicology);	Edward E. Doomes;	1 2	\$ 133,385 \$
				Total	\$ 133,385
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015EAR-07 EAR	Enhancing SUBR's Undergraduate and Graduate Research and Teaching Environment Through Instrument Acquisitions	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Environmental Toxicology);	Wesley G. Gray;	1	\$ 145,000
				Total	\$ 145,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					
016EAR-07 EAR	Enhancing the Employability of Urban Forestry Students Through Experiential Learning	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Urban Forestry);	Andra Johnson; Daniel Collins; Kamran Abdollahi;	1 2	\$ 42,000 \$ 54,000*
				Total	\$ 96,000
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
017EAR-07 EAR	Molecular Methods in Oceanographic Research at UL Lafayette	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Biology);	Andrei Chistoserdov; Johannes Rick; Joseph Neigel; Paul Klerks; Scott France; Suzanne Fredericq;	1	\$ 59,000
				Total	\$ 59,000
E					
Proposal is a New Request					

* Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018EAR-07 EAR	Enhancement of Heat Driven Air Conditioning Lab	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Mechanical Engineering);	Gongtao Wang; John Guillory; Terrence L. Chambers; William E. Simon;	1	\$ 154,285
				Total	\$ 154,285
E	Proposal is a New Request				
019EAR-07 EAR	The Geosciences Satellite Receiving Ground Station: Local Data Reception for Teaching and Research	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Geosciences);	M. Sean Chenoweth; J. Robert Howard;	1	\$ 73,800
				Total	\$ 73,800
E	Proposal is a New Request				
020EAR-07 EAR	Laboratory for Instrumentation Visualization Education (LIVE) and ULM Hurricane Evaluation at Landfall Project for Science (ULM HELPS)	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Geosciences);	J. Robert Howard;	1	\$ 86,111
				Total	\$ 86,111
E	Proposal is a New Request				

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Earth and Environmental Sciences for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
20	\$ 2,091,246	\$ 2,145,246	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

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

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
PURCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

- _____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 15 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- _____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |

No Points Given, But this is a required component B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine required component whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____