

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

IN

HUMANITIES

February 20, 2009

Prepared by:

Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Chair
Iowa State University

Dr. Samantha Cantrell
Middle Tennessee University

ENHANCEMENT REVIEW REPORT

HUMANITIES

FY 2008-09

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**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	89	001HUM-09	CEN	\$51,595	\$51,595		
1	89	012HUM-09	LSU-S	\$54,516	\$54,516	\$6,503	\$6,503
3	88.5	017HUM-09	ULL	\$71,787	\$63,087		
4	87.5	003HUM-09	LSU-A	\$32,305	\$32,305		
4	87.5	016HUM-09	ULL	\$100,606	\$68,762		
6	85.5	006HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$25,110	\$25,110	\$15,300	\$6,000
7	85	010HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$9,276	\$9,176	\$14,476	\$4,226
8	82	020HUM-09	ULM	\$8,250	\$4,400	\$5,000	\$0
8	82	021HUM-09	UNO	\$52,312	\$42,312		
10	80.5	004HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$69,564	\$41,374		
11	79.5	015HUM-09	SU-BR	\$53,586	\$47,586	\$0	\$0
12	78.5	014HUM-09	Nicholls	\$58,906	\$34,884		
13	77	019HUM-09	ULM	\$202,057	\$80,000		
14	74	007HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$76,860	\$33,860	\$34,000	\$0
TOTALS:				\$866,730	\$588,967	\$75,279	\$16,729

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
15	69	013HUM-09	LaTech	\$74,427	\$0		
16	68.5	022HUM-09	UNO	\$49,974	\$0		
17	67	008HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$14,713	\$0	\$32,307	\$0
17	67	011HUM-09	LSU-S	\$88,648	\$0		
19	64	009HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$58,656	\$0		
20	63.5	005HUM-09	LSU-BR	\$53,525	\$0	\$44,000	\$0
21	53.5	002HUM-09	Dillard	\$21,202	\$0	\$21,202	\$0
22	49	018HUM-09	ULM	\$59,025	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$420,170	\$0	\$97,509	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001HUM-09

INSTITUTION: Centenary College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Interdisciplinary Multimedia Laboratory for the Preservation and
Promotion of Language and Culture

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Maureen Murov

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. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 89 (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 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 _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (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: \$51,595
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$51,595

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 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002HUM-09

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Support for World Languages Department Foreign Language Teaching Assistants (WLTA) Program

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Julia Patino

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
B.2 11.5 (of 20 points)
B.3 14 (of 25 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Source:
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

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

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 53.5 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$21,202</u>	<u>\$21,202</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The 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 WLTAs 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 WLTAs teaching load would be; and most importantly, the department's strategic plan for incorporation of the WLTAs, including *which* languages WLTAs 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003HUM-09

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 87.5 (of 100 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 _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (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: \$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)

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)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 6 (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 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

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 Requested Amount: \$69,564
 RECOMMENDATIONS: 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Spanish Instruction Through Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michael B. Dettinger

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3.5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 20 points)
 B.3 14 (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 _____

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: 63.5 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$53,525</u>	<u>\$44,000</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.)

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.

RATING FORM 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)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 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 _____ (of 10 points)
 D.2b 9.5 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 16 (of 20 points)
 B.3 23 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 85.5 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$25,110</u>	<u>\$15,300</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$25,110</u>	<u>\$6,000</u>

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

This proposal 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

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 16 (of 20 points)
 B.3 22 (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 1 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$76,860</u>	<u>\$34,000</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$33,860</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal requests funds to 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)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertis

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

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 _____

E. Additional Funding Source:

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Award:

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$14,713</u>	<u>\$32,307</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

This proposal 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009HUM-09

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)

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

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

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: 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: (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 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)

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 _____ (of 10 points)
 D.2b 9 (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 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 _____

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.)

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$9,276</u>	<u>\$14,476</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$9,176</u>	<u>\$4,226</u>

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

This proposal 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

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 67 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 9 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (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 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: \$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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Education and Outreach Opportunities through Louisiana History-Related Audio-Visual Resources

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Laura McLemore

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 20 points)
B.3 21 (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 Source:
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 4 (of 4 points)

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

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 89 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$54,516</u>	<u>\$6,503</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$54,516</u>	<u>\$6,503</u>

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013HUM-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: SEARCH: Student Educational Achievement Research Center in the Humanities

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert W. Rudnicki

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 3 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

69

 (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 15 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (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 12 (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: \$74,427
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$0

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

This proposal seeks 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014HUM-09

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Moving Pictures, Culture, and Literature around Classrooms

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Vivian Bonamy

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1	Yes	<u>x</u>		No	
A.2		<u>4</u>			(of 5 points)
A.3		<u>4</u>			(of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1		<u>5</u>		(of 6 points)
C.2		<u>1</u>		(of 1 point)
C.3		<u>2</u>		(of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1		<u>3</u>		(of 5 points)
B.2		<u>12</u>		(of 15 points)
B.3		<u>15.5</u>		(of 20 points)
B.4		<u>5</u>		(of 5 points)
B.5		<u>1</u>		(of 2 points)
B.6		<u>4</u>		(of 5 points)
B.7	Yes	<u>x</u>	No	<u> </u>

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1		<u>11</u>		(of 12 points)
-----	--	-----------	--	----------------

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1		<u>3</u>		(of 4 points)
-----	--	----------	--	---------------

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1	Yes	<u>x</u>		No	
-----	-----	----------	--	----	--

H. Total Score: 78.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$58,906</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$34,884</u>

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

The 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015HUM-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Installing New Equipment to Enhance the Multimedia Room in the
Department of English and Philosophy at Southern University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sumita Roy

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 2.5 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (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 12 (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 _____

H. Total Score: 79.5 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$53,586</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$47,586</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Louisiana Digital Humanities Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Laudun

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 2.5 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 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 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 12 (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 _____

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: Recommended Amount: \$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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Lâche pas la Parole [Don't Lose the Language]

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jennifer C. Ritter

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)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 17 (of 20 points)
 B.3 24 (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 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score: 88.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$71,787 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$63,087 </u>

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

This proposal 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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 49 (of 100 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 _____

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 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: \$59,025
 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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019HUM-09

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

(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 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 5 (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 14 (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 12 (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 _____

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)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 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 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

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$8,250</u>	<u>\$5,000</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$4,400</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The 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)

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 _____ (of 10 points)
 D.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

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 _____

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.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 022HUM-09

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Composition and Rhetoric Classroom Technology Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elizabeth Blankenship

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 1 (of 3 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

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)
 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 _____ No _____ x _____

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

Complete List: Enhancement Program: TR Proposals: Humanities

Number	PI Name	Project Title	Amount Requested			Institution
			Year 1 ----	Year2-----	Total	
001HUM-09	Murov, Maureen	Interdisciplinary Multimedia Laboratory for the Preservation and Promotion of Language and Culture	\$51,595	\$0	\$51,595	Centenary College
002HUM-09	Patino, Julia	Support for World Languages Department Foreign Language Teaching Assistants (WLTA) Program	\$21,202	\$21,202	\$42,404	Dillard University
003HUM-09	Beard, Elizabeth	Enhancement of LSUA Writing Center	\$32,305	\$0	\$32,305	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria
004HUM-09	Dettinger, Michael	Enhancing Film Resources in the College of Arts and Sciences	\$69,564	\$0	\$69,564	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
005HUM-09	Dettinger, Michael	Enhancing Spanish Instruction Through Technology	\$53,525	\$44,000	\$97,525	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
006HUM-09	Dubois, Sylvie	The Louisiana Bilingualism Research Initiative at LSU	\$25,110	\$15,300	\$40,410	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
007HUM-09	Gourdine, Angeletta	Caribbean Dislocations/Caribbean Diasporas ACWWWS Conference and Caribbean Women s Postdoctoral Program	\$76,860	\$34,000	\$110,860	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
008HUM-09	Stone, Gregory	LSU Comparative Literature Program Enhancement	\$14,713	\$32,307	\$47,020	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
009HUM-09	Weinstein, Susan	Spoken Word Poetry Performance and Curriculum Development	\$58,656	\$0	\$58,656	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge

10 HUM-09	Weltman, Sharon	The Dickens Project at LSU	\$9,276	\$14,476	\$23,752	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
11 HUM-09	Garcie, Allen	Multi-User Virtual Environments Laboratory for Liberal Arts Majors	\$88,648	\$0	\$88,648	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport
12 HUM-09	McLemore, Laura	ENHANCING EDUCATION AND OUTREACH OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH LOUISIANA HISTORY-RELATED AUDIO-VISUAL RESOURCES	\$54,516	\$6,503	\$61,019	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport
13 HUM-09	Rudnicki, Robert	SEARCH: Student Educational Achievement Research Center in the Humanities	\$74,427	\$0	\$74,427	Louisiana Tech University
14 HUM-09	Bonamy, Vivian	“Moving Pictures, Culture, and Literature around Classrooms”	\$58,906	\$0	\$58,906	Nicholls State University
15 HUM-09	Roy, Sumita	Installing New Equipment to Enhance the Multimedia Room in the Department of English and Philosophy at Southern University	\$53,586	\$0	\$53,586	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge
016HUM-09	Laudun, John	Louisiana Digital Humanities Lab	\$100,606	\$0	\$100,606	University of Louisiana at Lafayette
017HUM-09	Ritter, Jennifer	Lâche pas la Parole (Don't Lose the Language)	\$71,787	\$0	\$71,787	University of Louisiana at Lafayette
018HUM-09	Bontty, Monica	Enhancement Grant for Smart Classrooms and Educational Videos	\$59,025	\$0	\$59,025	University of Louisiana at Monroe

019HUM-09	Eller, Edward	The ULM Department of English Technological Rejuvenation: Redesign and Expansion	\$202,057	\$0	\$202,057	University of Louisiana at Monroe
020HUM-09	Smith, Ruth	Festival of Languages	\$8,250	\$5,000	\$13,250	University of Louisiana at Monroe
021HUM-09	Atkinson, Connie	Unclaimed History: The Orleans Parish School Board Collection at the University of New Orleans	\$52,312	\$0	\$52,312	University of New Orleans
022HUM-09	Blankenship, Elizabeth	Composition and Rhetoric Classroom Technology Enhancement	\$49,974	\$0	\$49,974	University of New Orleans

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2008-09

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 whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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 | <u>For science/engineering proposals only:</u> 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 | <u>For non-science/non-engineering proposals only:</u> 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 2008-09
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 whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

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: _____