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Introduction

The Humanities Review Panel consisting of Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Chair, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Iowa State University; and Dr. Samantha Cantrell, Grant Development Specialist, Middle Tennessee State University, met via phone conference on February 20, 2009, to evaluate twenty-two (22) Humanities proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: (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 Humanities report (FY 2005-06); and (4) the FY 2008-09 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel met via teleconference to review and evaluate them. During the review 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-two (22) Humanities proposals submitted in FY 2008-09 requested a total of $1,286,900 in first-year funds. Fourteen (14) proposals were highly recommended for funding, eleven (11) 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 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>89</td>
<td>001HUM-09</td>
<td>CEN</td>
<td>$51,595</td>
<td>$51,595</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>012HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-S</td>
<td>$54,516</td>
<td>$54,516</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>017HUM-09</td>
<td>ULL</td>
<td>$71,787</td>
<td>$63,087</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
<td>$6,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>003HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-A</td>
<td>$32,305</td>
<td>$32,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>016HUM-09</td>
<td>ULL</td>
<td>$100,606</td>
<td>$68,762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>006HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$25,110</td>
<td>$25,110</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>010HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$9,276</td>
<td>$9,176</td>
<td>$14,476</td>
<td>$4,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>020HUM-09</td>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>021HUM-09</td>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>$52,312</td>
<td>$42,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>004HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$69,564</td>
<td>$41,374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>015HUM-09</td>
<td>SU-BR</td>
<td>$53,586</td>
<td>$47,586</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>014HUM-09</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$58,906</td>
<td>$34,884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>019HUM-09</td>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$202,057</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>007HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$76,860</td>
<td>$33,860</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $866,730 $588,967 $75,279 $16,729

### TABLE II
**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>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>013HUM-09</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$74,427</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>022HUM-09</td>
<td>UNO</td>
<td>$49,974</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>008HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$14,713</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,307</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>011HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-S</td>
<td>$88,648</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>009HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$58,656</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>005HUM-09</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$53,525</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>002HUM-09</td>
<td>Dillard</td>
<td>$21,202</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$21,202</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>018HUM-09</td>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$59,025</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:** $420,170 $0 $97,509 $0
The proposal requests funds to create a new technology-based multimedia classroom that emphasizes immersion in target language and cultures. The unit's current resources are outdated and one classroom sees heavy use by another unit (English). The proposed lab would also be home to a heritage language press which engages undergraduates in experiential learning (real research and publishing) as part of their study. The heritage language press is the only teaching university press in the United States. The press publishes works that focus on Louisiana's unique multicultural and multilingual heritage. While revenue from book sales offsets operational costs of the press, enhancement funds are needed to support the requested equipment upgrade. Centenary plans to assess a $25 per course fee to support and maintain the multimedia lab long-term, which the panel strongly endorses. This proposal builds on an earlier Support Fund award and technological enhancement of resources for the press will strengthen Centenary's unique and valuable undergraduate program. The panel recommends full funding.
The PIs and department are forward thinking in their stated goals to prepare undergraduate students for global communication regardless of a student’s career track. World language education is slow in opening up to this broader mission, so Dillard is ahead of the curve. However, the proposal as submitted does not make a strong case. The document is not well written and the argument for Enhancement funds is not thoughtfully made. For instance, one of the proposed goals is to “provide free time for faculty to participate in professional development seminars and workshops to improve expertise in teaching of foreign languages.” Lowering faculty teaching loads should not be the stated goal of Enhancement funds. The proposal could be improved by demonstrating how the WLTA will increase or improve the instruction received by students. Native speakers alone do not improve instruction or student learning. Additional information needed includes: an overview of the WLTA program and the costs required for an institution to participate in the program; what Fulbright provides in funding; what the WLTA teaching load would be; and most importantly, the department’s strategic plan for incorporation of the WLTA, including which languages WLTA will teach and why those particular languages, and how the program would be sustained past year two. Much more specificity overall is needed to improve this proposal. The budget pages and budget narrative do not match. Funding is not recommended.
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College-Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of LSUA Writing Center

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elizabeth M. Beard

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes x No
A.2 5 (of 5 points)
A.3 4.5 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 15 points)
B.3 17 (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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)
F.1 4 (of 4 points)

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

H. Total Score: 87.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $32,305
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $32,305

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 request for equipment seeks to enhance the ability of the LSU-A Writing Center to provide needed support to students who require one-on-one tutoring to improve their writing proficiency. The Writing Center's support also extends to faculty, which is valuable in that it demonstrates faculty engagement with the mission of the Center. The PI provides a good description of the increased demand for student and faculty services from the Writing Center. The design of the Writing Center seems particularly well thought-out and the PI is well versed in the field of composition studies. Enhancement funds are sought to supplement the number of computers, supplies, and related equipment so that the Writing Center can increase its capability to provide tutoring and one-on-one support of the students who seek out help. LSU-A has a largely non-traditional student audience, reflected by the fact that it awards both two-year and four-year degrees. Non-traditional students are more likely to need some extra assistance in getting their academic writing skills up to speed or polished. Providing personalized and high-quality tutoring in academic writing is a significant way to retain students and to enable them to succeed. The panel believes that the project will have a positive impact on the very good track record established by the Writing Center. The institution contributes the wages for a student tutor and will cover construction costs, which indicates its own investment in this project. The panel recommends full funding.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Film Resources in the College of Arts and Sciences

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael B. Dettinger

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 62 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 19.5 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
C.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 1 (of 2 points)
D.2a (For S/E)
D.2b 6 (of 10 points)

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)
E.1 1 (of 4 points)

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

G. Total Score: 80.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $69,564
Recommended Amount: $41,374

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

This proposal is a well-planned collaborative effort to improve effectiveness of and user access to multiple film libraries on campus. The units and/or programs involved are: Foreign Languages and Literatures, French Studies, the Foreign Language Laboratory, Arts & Sciences Program for Study of Film and Media Arts, Communication across the Curriculum, and Studio 151 (digital media lab). The scope of collaboration is impressive. The panel agrees that the plan to create one integrated database inventory of multiple related film libraries will enhance student and faculty use of these resources, as well as create needed efficiencies. The enhanced viewing and storage facilities and video conversion from VHS are logical enhancements. The panel would have liked the equipment section to include a detailed narrative even though the cover page categorizes this as a proposal for enhancements other than equipment. The real institutional match here is minimal given the total projected cost of the project. Partial funding is recommended, with no funding recommended for projector installation. The panel suggests that the institution pick up this cost. Since the main goal is to improve access to the film resources, upgrade equipment, and replace worn-out materials, the panel recommends substantially scaling back the purchase of new titles by $26,150. The institutional match, though minimal, is to be maintained in full.
The proposal requests funds to launch a pilot project to develop three hybrid courses in lower-level foreign languages. Hybrid language instruction is increasingly developed by institutions as a way to use classroom time for more effective interaction. Furthermore, the hybrid proposal builds upon previous Board of Regents Enhancement funds to develop on-line testing enhancement. However, the proposed cost of research on hybrid courses, training of faculty, and the hiring of Spanish graduate assistants in the foreign language lab to support online components seems excessive to the reviewers. Of the total requested, $88,000 is requested to hire graduate students, an ongoing operational expense the panel believes the institution should support. There is no indication of how this project is sustainable beyond year two. Funding is not recommended.
### Proposal for Enhancement Requests Other Than Equipment Purchases

**Proposal Number:** 006HUM-09  
**Institution:** Louisiana State University and A&M College-Baton Rouge  
**Title of Proposal:** The Louisiana Bilingualism Research Initiative at LSU  
**Principal Investigator:** Sylvie Dubois

#### A. The Current Situation  
(Total of 10 Points)  
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. The Enhancement Plan  
(Total of 62 Points)  
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>16 (of 20 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>23 (of 25 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>2 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Faculty and Staff Expertise  
(Total of 12 Points)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>12 (of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact  
(Total of 12 Points)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2a</td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2b</td>
<td>9.5 (For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E. Additional Funding Sources  
(Total of 4 Points)  
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>4 (of 4 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### G. Total Score: 85.5 (of 100 points)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</th>
<th>Requested Amount:</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,110</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Amount:** $25,110  
**Recommended Amount:** $6,000

**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 proposal from the Center for French and Francophone Studies (CFFS) seeks support for an ambitious and very exciting project on the historical dimension of Louisiana bilingualism. The CFFS is a documentation center with a research focus that brings international visibility to the unique linguistic situation of the Louisiana region. We support the CFFS's proposal to enhance the quality and quantity of its resources available to the public by transcription and digitization of four previously inaccessible data sets (corpora). The PI has a strong record of promoting Louisiana's particular cultural and linguistic heritage through academic work, grant funding, and entrepreneurial approaches to linking French and Francophone Studies with regional economic development and tourism. The proposed symposium should increase attention to the unique linguistic corpora housed in the Center. The timeline for digitizing, transcribing, and delivering the corpora to prospective symposium speakers is very tight and more time may be necessary to ensure high-quality processing of the corpora, as well as adequate input from the prospective researchers. Partial funding is recommended, with no funding recommended for conference travel and lodging costs, which the panel feels are excessive. Year 2 funding is reduced to $6,000 to support a cataloger/web designer.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Caribbean Dislocations/Caribbean Diasporas ACWWWS Conference and Caribbean Women's Postdoctoral Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Angeletta Gourdine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 62 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.1 2 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 16 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 22 (of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)</th>
<th>B.4 3 (of 5 points)</th>
<th>B.5 2 (of 2 points)</th>
<th>B.6 3 (of 5 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1 10 (of 12 points)</td>
<td>B.7 Yes x No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)</th>
<th>E. Additional Funding Sources (Total of 4 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>E.1 1 (of 4 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or D.2b 7 (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned)</th>
<th>G. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.1 Yes x No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 1 | YEAR 2
---|---
$76,860 | $34,000

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 proposal requests funds to host the 12th Biannual Conference of the Caribbean Women Writers and Scholars Association, as well as to establish a post-doctoral fellowship program in Caribbean Studies at LSU. LSU has invested in developing strong academic programs in African and African American Studies as well as Louisiana and Caribbean Studies, and implementing a hiring initiative in the area of Caribbean Studies. If hosted by LSU, this will be the first time that this Conference is held outside the Caribbean proper, which will bring a great deal of visibility to LSU and the city of Baton Rouge. The PI argues that the Conference and proposed post-doctoral fellowship program will serve as a recruiting tool for LSU. While this may be so, the panel is troubled by the fact that the budget documents no real institutional investment in the Conference, and no investment whatsoever in the post-doctoral fellowship program. There should be a letter of support from the dean or provost that indicates a commitment of funding to host the Conference and to sustain the post-doctoral fellows program beyond the scope of Enhancement funding. The institutional investment in and sustainability of the post-doctoral fellows program is simply not addressed, so the panel does not recommend support for these in either year one or year two. The panel recommends partial funding of $33,860 to support conference funding in year one. Funding is not recommended for $3,000 in conference refreshments which are disallowed in the RFP, and the panel recommends reducing the $26,000 budget for invited guests by $6,250. The institutional match should be maintained in full.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LSU Comparative Literature Program Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gregory B. Stone

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 62 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 13 (of 20 points)
B.3 16 (of 25 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)
C.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)
D.1 2 (of 2 points)
D.2a (For S/E)
or
D.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

E. Additional Funding Source (Total of 4 Points)
E.1 1 (of 4 points)

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

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

(No score: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: YEAR 1 YEAR 2
Recommended Amount:

$14,713 $32,307

$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.)

This proposal seeks to increase the quality and number of graduate students in LSU’s Comparative Literature program by hosting the 2010 meeting of the Southern Comparative Literature Association, by developing promotional materials, and by hosting a high-profile speaker. This interdisciplinary program is unique in the region and typically enrolls 20 students annually. The long-term goals of increased promotion and visibility are increased recruitment and an elevation in the program’s NRC rankings. The PI is highly qualified and a past recipient of a Support Fund award. Hosting the SCLA Conference is an ideal opportunity for LSU to showcase its unique program and its faculty, and allows for engagement of its students in the profession. The materials for publicity and website investment are well conceived and appropriate to the goal of the proposal. However, the panel found no evidence of institutional support for this project, neither a written endorsement nor a budgetary commitment. This directly contradicts the letter from the Association indicating that the host institution is expected to contribute support. The budget narrative lacks any detailed explanation of the expenses for which Enhancement funding is requested. The third major element of this proposal, a high profile speaker in year two, is not adequately justified as a critical component of program building, and again no institutional support is indicated. The lack of institutional support (at the department chair, dean or provost level) has resulted in a recommendation by the panel that the proposal not be funded.
**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana State University and A&M College-Baton Rouge  
**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Spoken Word Poetry Performance and Curriculum Development  
**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Susan Weinstein

### 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 62 Points)
- **B.1** 4 (of 5 points)
- **B.2** 16 (of 20 points)
- **B.3** 17 (of 25 points)
- **B.4** 3 (of 5 points)
- **B.5** 2 (of 2 points)
- **B.6** 4 (of 5 points)
- **B.7** Yes [x] No

### C. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)
- **C.1** 10 (of 12 points)
- **C.2** 4 (of 5 points)

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

### 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 [x] No

### G. Total Score: 64 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $58,656  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: $0

**COMMENTS:**

This partnership between LSU, the WordPlay Teen Writing Program, and McKinley High School is highly creative and engaging. The PI argues convincingly the importance and attractiveness of spoken word poetry (akin to rap) to young people today. This collaboration engages undergraduates, graduates, the PI, and secondary school teachers in curriculum development. However, the primary beneficiary of the enhancement is the high school and, on an individual level, the PI who will be able to move her own research program forward. The panel does not see this proposal as fulfilling the higher education goals of this competition. The notable lack of institutional funding is another major drawback in recommending support for this project. Finally, the proposal itself was missing several required sections ("economic and cultural impact"; "additional funding support"; and "previous BoR support"), which needed to be addressed, even if only briefly. While the panel liked the project itself, it did not believe it met the requirements of the Enhancement Program. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Dickens Project at LSU

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sharon Weltman

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 23 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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 (For S/E) or
D.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

E. Additional Funding Source
(Total of 4 Points)
E.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Award
(No Points Assigned)
F.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.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount:

YEAR 1 YEAR 2

$9,276 $14,476

Recommended Amount:

$9,176 $4,226

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 funding to enhance participation by the Department of English in the Dickens Project, an international initiative focused on academic research addressing the Victorian era. The Department of English is one of the strongest units at LSU and houses a cutting edge graduate program. Funding is sought for three initiatives: a major speaker, travel funds for four doctoral students, and a website. The PIs have a solid record securing grant support and have argued effectively for the outreach potential of the Dickens Project via educational enrichment of teachers and community outreach with regard to the popularity of Victorian culture in the region. The panel found the support requested for graduate student travel and required conference presentation of their research to be highly valuable enhancement to the Department's program and visibility. The panel was disappointed that no institutional contribution is indicated in the budget, although the narrative explains that the department chair will pay the annual membership fee for the Dickens Project. The amount of the fee is not indicated. Partial funding is recommended in year one and year two. Funding is not recommended for publicity and website upgrade, and the panel suggests that the institution cover these costs. The panel is not convinced of the centrality of having Simon Callow, a popular actor, as an invited speaker in year two, particularly since he is not a Victorian scholar, and no funding is recommended for this.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 011HUM-09

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Multi-User Virtual Environments Laboratory for Liberal Arts Majors

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Allen Garcie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 52 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes</td>
<td>B.1 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>B.2 9 (of 15 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 3 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 13 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>B.4 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 3 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>B.5 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
<td>B.6 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 3 (of 3 points)</td>
<td>B.7 Yes x No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| C.1 3 (of 6 points)                         | D. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points) |
| C.2 1 (of 1 point)                          | D.1 11 (of 12 points)                         |
| C.3 3 (of 3 points)                         | F. Additional Funding Sources (Total of 4 Points) |
| E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points) | F.1 4 (of 4 points) |
| E.1 1 (of 2 points)                         | G. Previous Support Fund Awards (No Points Assigned) |
| E.2a (For S/E)                              | G.1 Yes x No                                 |
| or (of 10 points)                           |                                             |
| E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)                          |                                             |

| H. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)          |                                             |

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**

**Requested Amount:** $88,648

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

**Recommended Amount:** $0

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

The proposal seeks funds to establish and institutionalize a computer-enhanced lab for virtual environments for use by both students and faculty. The PI is dean of the college, which indicates a substantial institutional commitment and the potential for broad impact of the project. This project has value in incorporating the latest technology for virtual environments in the humanities. The university makes a substantial match in funds for furniture. However, the proposal fails to give enough specificity about how the virtual environments will be used or how instructors will use this classroom more effectively than a traditional computer classroom. The equipment requested will be used only by small classes. Will some disciplines be excluded from its use? Which disciplines and/or groups will use this lab and for what? A more detailed description of specific uses for this lab would greatly improve the overall effectiveness of the proposal in the future. While this proposal communicates an innovative vision, that vision is not yet developed enough to recommend funding this year.
The PI, who is director of the Archives and Special Collections (ASC) at LSU-Shreveport, seeks to preserve a collection of valuable archival materials that are at risk of destruction due to age and environmental conditions. These at-risk negatives and cassette tapes preserve a record of the multiracial and multiethnic history, society and culture of Northwest Louisiana through an archive that is accessible to the community of scholars at the University, to school districts, and to the general public. If preserved and digitized, the ASC's collection of 100,000 at-risk negatives and 467 cassette tapes will be made available for teaching, learning, and outreach projects. The PI seeks equipment and materials for digitization and physical preservation of the original materials. The request builds on archival work funded previously by the Support Fund. The panel was pleased to see a meaningful institutional contribution of funds. The panel agrees with the need to have a project assistant for this ambitious project. The timeline for preservation of 100,000 negatives is tight. The panel questions whether the technician's pay is high enough at only $8.00/hour. Finally the panel would have liked to see an itemized budget, particularly for the equipment request. The PI may want to investigate the potential for future funding from the NEH Office of Digital Humanities, which is interested in projects of this type. Full funding is recommended.
This proposal seeks funds to enhance a series of new facilities for the Department of English. The Department boasts a prominent room recently dedicated to advanced studies in literature and culture that is also used as a workroom for students creating and editing an online journal. The room contains nine workstations and a training table with four laptops. It serves as an electronic classroom for small graduate seminars, a commons for student majors, and a hub for coordinating and promoting student writing and research. The PI is the coordinator of the English graduate program so is entirely familiar with the range of uses for this room. The panel was unsure of the scope of impact of this project if funded. It appears that only a small, limited group of students (graduate and advanced undergraduates) in one academic major will benefit. The proposal addresses no plan or potential for how this activity might have outreach or community impact. The argument for producing an online journal is not as compelling as it could be. The journal is not cast as one with a particular focus beyond being a vehicle for the graduate students in this particular program (and maybe others if the journal succeeds and expands). The proposal seems to assume, "if you build it, they will come," but the panel would have liked more information about graduate student engagement with these specific objectives. No funding is recommended.
The PI successfully argues for the need to utilize technology to provide cutting-edge instruction in world languages and cultures. There is no doubt that this is true, nor is there doubt that new textbook packages assume instructor and student access to audio and video equipment both in and beyond the classroom. A strong case was made that instruction in languages and literatures at Nicholls will benefit from portable technology that can be used in any classroom and by multiple instructors. Any instructor seeking to use the technology carts will be required to undergo training and will likewise be required to contribute materials to a shared site for instructor portfolio activities. This requirement benefits the entire teaching faculty and will ultimately result in better and more collaborative instruction. The Languages and Literatures Department currently has a faculty of four. The panel feels that three technology carts will serve the needs of the faculty and recommends partial funding with computer equipment and supplies proportionally reduced to fit the three carts. Software and Software Maintenance should also be reduced to reflect the three cart computers and the desktop computer. The panel does not recommend funding for the five iPods because their use was not deemed to be critical to the success of this proposal. Funding is also not recommended for personnel training. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
The proposal seeks funds for equipment to enhance the multimedia classroom in the Department of English and Philosophy. The PI makes a solid case that the department is in desperate need of equipment upgrades to better provide students with high-quality instruction, particularly in technical writing and developmental English. The panel agrees that strong writing skills are absolutely critical to both the academic and long-term career success of students. The PI is an assistant professor of English with expertise in technical writing and developmental English, so she is highly qualified to carry out the proposed work. The equipment request is well planned. The panel has some concerns that the timeline from equipment purchase to installation is too lengthy. Although this was submitted as a two-year grant it appears to be a one-year project. The institutional match is solely in faculty release time. Partial funding is recommended, with no funding recommended for supplies. The panel feels the institution should pick up these costs.
<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 52 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No</td>
<td>B.1 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 12 (of 15 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 18 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Equipment</td>
<td>B.4 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>B.5 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 5 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>B.6 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
<td>B.7 Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 2.5 (of 3 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 2 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or (of 10 points)</td>
<td>D.1 12 (of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b 8 (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Total Score: **87.5** (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $100,606

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** $68,762

**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 funds to secure resources and space for the specialized development of humanistic scholarship through technology in the Department of English and Humanities Resource Center (HRC). This is a very compelling proposal and at the forefront of the digital humanities movement. The vision of students and scholars collaborating in the creation of documents with layers of metatext sounds like the humanities equivalent of a Geographic Information System. The project will reconfigure a 12-station digital humanities lab for the use of graduate students, advanced undergraduates, and faculty. The panel believes that it will contribute to the national discussion of how digital technology can change how scholars and students approach humanities research through technology. The proposal could have been improved with an initial introduction to the Humanities Resource Center and subsequently a discussion of how the proposed digital humanities lab is distinct from and/or enhances the HRC. The means of assessing the effectiveness of the lab and the value of this investment are not well articulated. However, the PIs have a history of securing grant funding and producing results, so the panel finds them well qualified to lead this highly original Enhancement project. The panel recommends funding only the equipment portion of this proposal at $68,762, with no funding recommended for software, shipping, personnel training and stipends. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally.
This proposal seeks funds to digitize and preserve materials in the Archives of Cajun and Creole Folklore (ACCF) which is housed within the Center for Cultural and Eco-Tourism. These valuable primary sources document the oral history (cultural and social) as well as the music history of the Southwest Louisiana region. The ACCF is wise to pursue funding in order to make this collection of resources accessible to the general public, making the collection of value to both scholarly and general audiences. Because the digitization must be carried out in real time, the panel agrees that there is a need for two graduate and two undergraduate student assistants to carry out the work in a timely manner. The panel recommends partial funding, with no funding for faculty/staff travel for professional development ($8,700). The panel feels that the institution should cover these costs. The institutional match should be maintained in full.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement for Smart Classrooms and Educational Videos

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Monica Bontty

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 52 Points)
B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 5 (of 15 points)
B.3 9 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 9 (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) (of 10 points)
or 
E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)
F.1 2 (of 4 points)

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

H. Total Score: 49 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $59,025
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $0

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

The proposal makes a strong argument for the need to upgrade instructional technology resources in History Department classrooms. There is currently no smart classroom in Brown Hall, nor does the department have IT equipment for faculty use. However, this proposal is poorly written and highly repetitive. It does not provide detailed information on the number of classes that will be scheduled in these technology-equipped rooms nor the number of seats in each classroom. Furthermore, the budget narrative does not explain what materials are needed and why they are needed. What are “Creative Presentations”? Why are varying amounts (74, 14, 26) of different items requested? Given the way the proposal is written, it is impossible for the reviewers to understand what the requested funds will purchase. The proposal does not articulate any plan for assessment. While the proposed project seems to be an important enhancement for ULM, the proposal narrative itself is not developed and, on the whole, fails to provide specific information that the guidelines ask for, e.g., measurable objectives, benchmarks, timeline, description of specific personnel roles, more specific impacts on students, curriculum, and faculty. Future submissions to this competition should include these required proposal components. Funding is not recommended.
### INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

### TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The ULM Department of English Technological Rejuvenation: Redesign and Expansion

### PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edward Eller

#### A. The Current Situation

<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>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 10 Points)

#### B. The Enhancement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(of Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(of 15 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 52 Points)

#### C. Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(of Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 10 Points)

#### D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(of Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td>(of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 12 Points)

#### F. Additional Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(of 4 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total of 4 Points)

#### G. Previous Support Fund Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(No Points Assigned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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: | $202,057 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS Recommended Amount: | $80,000 |

**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 proposal requests funds to increase the number of English Department computer classrooms from two to four. The equipment to be purchased would allow for increased online technologies and enhanced pedagogies to be incorporated into instruction in keeping with disciplinary trends and in fulfillment of the institution's strategic plan. The PIs are highly qualified and document a solid history of external funding, including Support Fund awards. This is an ambitious project and, as reflected in the narrative, there is not universal buy-in from all faculty as to the value of technologically-enhanced instruction. The courses as envisioned by the PIs may not happen as quickly or fully as planned, but the proposed activities should still be implemented. The narrative and budget are detailed but do not communicate exactly what is being replaced, refurbished, or purchased in each of the classrooms. Are only 26 computers being replaced across three rooms? The panel was not convinced of the centrality of the separate faculty training lab. The panel suggests that one of the classrooms double for faculty training if the training were scheduled for times when classes are not in session (e.g., evenings, weekends). The panel recommends partial funding of this project, with no funding recommended for the faculty lab or personnel training. Further reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Festival of Languages

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ruth E. Smith

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1  4  (of 5 points)
B.2  16  (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  No  x

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

C.1  11  (of 12 points)

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

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

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

G. Total Score: 82  (of 100 points)

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

YEAR 1 YEAR 2

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $8,250 $5,000

Recommended Amount: $4,400 $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 Foreign Languages proposes a valuable activity that serves to promote its faculty expertise and programs, to showcase its students, and to recruit engaged foreign language students to the institution. Just as important, it is a notable outreach effort to area high schools and creates community among foreign language teachers in the region. The funds requested for year one are modest, but should have been much more clearly described in the budget narrative, which was too brief. No justification was provided for funds for year two. Almost nothing in the narrative explained how the festival would be sustained in future years. However, because this project builds on the success of the long-running Spanish festival, there is a good likelihood that it will meet expectations and will continue. The panel was very disappointed that there was no institutional commitment of funding or in-kind support, which is very short-sighted since this is a solid recruitment effort not only for the department, but for the institution. The panel recommends partial funding of this request in year one, with no funding for year two. Refreshments and meals for teachers are not allowable expenses according to the RFP and funding for them is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Unclaimed History: The Orleans Parish School Board Collection at the University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Connie Z. Atkinson

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 62 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 20 points)
B.3 22 (of 25 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No

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 (For S/E)
D.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)
E.1 2 (of 4 points)

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

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $52,312
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $42,312

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 History at UNO has a long-term plan for growth and excellence that seeks to embrace its mission of service to its urban community, and this project helps fulfill the objectives of that plan. The proposal seeks funds to support a part-time researcher and two graduate students in order to create a practical survey (or index) of the Orleans Parish School Board Collection housed at the institution. This collection, which is central to the history of education and race relations in the region, is currently inaccessible to researchers who are hindered by the extreme difficulty of locating information among the many materials. With creation of an index, the PI aims to increase access to the collection by students, faculty, researchers and community members, thereby ensuring that it is utilized and promoted. The panel recommends partial funding, with funding for only one graduate student recommended.
### 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)

### B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)
- B.1 4 (of 5 points)
- B.2 11.5 (of 15 points)
- B.3 14 (of 20 points)
- B.4 2 (of 5 points)
- B.5 1 (of 2 points)
- B.6 2 (of 5 points)

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

### D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
- D.1 9 (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) (of 10 points)
- E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

### 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: 68.5 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $49,974

**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: $0

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

The proposal requests funds for equipment to create two additional electronic classrooms for use by the English Department for its students. The narrative states that the request is specifically for classrooms for upper division courses, but then references the impact on freshman composition. The panel did not find the equipment request unreasonable, but the proposal did not address specific innovative projects, assignments or approaches that would result in a notable enhancement of learning and teaching. The timeline addresses purchase and installment of the equipment but, in contrast to other proposals in this competition, there is no mention of faculty training either on the equipment or with new pedagogies. Will faculty be required to participate in some sort of training? Will they be required to participate in building shared resources for teaching composition and literature? This proposal appeared to the panel as a standard request for equipment and was missing the "enhancement" dimension. No funding is recommended.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>001HUM-09</td>
<td>Murov, Maureen</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Multimedia Laboratory for the Preservation and Promotion of Language and Culture</td>
<td>$51,595</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002HUM-09</td>
<td>Patino, Julia</td>
<td>Support for World Languages Department Foreign Language Teaching Assistants (WLTA) Program</td>
<td>$21,202</td>
<td>$21,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003HUM-09</td>
<td>Beard, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Enhancement of LSUA Writing Center</td>
<td>$32,305</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004HUM-09</td>
<td>Dettinger, Michael</td>
<td>Enhancing Film Resources in the College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>$69,564</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005HUM-09</td>
<td>Dettinger, Michael</td>
<td>Enhancing Spanish Instruction Through Technology</td>
<td>$53,525</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006HUM-09</td>
<td>Dubois, Sylvie</td>
<td>The Louisiana Bilingualism Research Initiative at LSU</td>
<td>$25,110</td>
<td>$15,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007HUM-09</td>
<td>Gourdin, Angeletta</td>
<td>Caribbean Dislocations/Caribbean Diasporas ACWWWS Conference and Caribbean Women’s Postdoctoral Program</td>
<td>$76,860</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008HUM-09</td>
<td>Stone, Gregory</td>
<td>LSU Comparative Literature Program Enhancement</td>
<td>$14,713</td>
<td>$32,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009HUM-09</td>
<td>Weinstein, Susan</td>
<td>Spoken Word Poetry Performance and Curriculum Development</td>
<td>$58,656</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 HUM-09</td>
<td>Weltman, Sharon</td>
<td>The Dickens Project at LSU</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$9,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 HUM-09</td>
<td>Garce, Allen</td>
<td>Multi-User Virtual Environments Laboratory for Liberal Arts Majors</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Shreveport</td>
<td>$88,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 HUM-09</td>
<td>McLemore, Laura</td>
<td>ENHANCING EDUCATION AND OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH LOUISIANA HISTORY-RELATED AUDIO-VISUAL RESOURCES</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Shreveport</td>
<td>$54,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 HUM-09</td>
<td>Rudnicki, Robert</td>
<td>SEARCH: Student Educational Achievement Research Center in the Humanities</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>$74,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 HUM-09</td>
<td>Bonamy, Vivian</td>
<td>“Moving Pictures, Culture, and Literature around Classrooms”</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>$58,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 HUM-09</td>
<td>Roy, Sumita</td>
<td>Installing New Equipment to Enhance the Multimedia Room in the Department of English and Philosophy at Southern University</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at Baton Rouge</td>
<td>$53,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016HUM-09</td>
<td>Laudun, John</td>
<td>Louisiana Digital Humanities Lab</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>$100,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017HUM-09</td>
<td>Ritter, Jennifer</td>
<td>Lâche pas la Parole (Don't Lose the Language)</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>$71,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018HUM-09</td>
<td>Bontty, Monica</td>
<td>Enhancement Grant for Smart Classrooms and Educational Videos</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td>$59,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Number</td>
<td>Applicant Name</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Second Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019HUM-09</td>
<td>Eller, Edward</td>
<td>The ULM Department of English Technological Rejuvenation: Redesign and Expansion</td>
<td>$202,057</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020HUM-09</td>
<td>Smith, Ruth</td>
<td>Festival of Languages</td>
<td>$8,250</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021HUM-09</td>
<td>Atkinson, Connie</td>
<td>Unclaimed History: The Orleans Parish School Board Collection at the University of New Orleans</td>
<td>$52,312</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022HUM-09</td>
<td>Blankenship, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Composition and Rhetoric Classroom Technology Enhancement</td>
<td>$49,974</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Number of Proposals submitted | 22 |  |
| Total Money Requested for First Year | $1,286,900.01 |
| Total Money Requested for Second Year | $172,788.00 |
| Total Money Requested | $1,459,688.01 |
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, as necessary.

**A. THE CURRENT SITUATION**—Total of 10 points

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS:**

**B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN**—Total of 52 points

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Points Given, but this is a required component.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. 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:____________________________

(Form 6.11, rev 2008)
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A.1</th>
<th>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?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 5 pts.</td>
<td>A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 5 pts.</td>
<td>A.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—Total of 62 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>B.1</th>
<th>Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 5 pts.</td>
<td>B.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 20 pts.</td>
<td>B.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 5 pts.</td>
<td>B.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 2 pts.</td>
<td>B.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_____ of 5 pts.</td>
<td>B.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. 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:

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 6.12, rev.2008)