

**REPORT TO THE
LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

**REVIEW OF MULTI-DISCIPLINARY
ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
FY 2006-2007**

PREPARED BY:

Dr. Charles L. Liotta
Vice Provost for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies
Office of the Provost
Regents' Professor, Chemistry/Chemical Engineering
School of Chemistry and Biochemistry and
School of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology

Date

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS REVIEW OF MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

Introduction

Fourteen multi-disciplinary enhancement proposals were supplied by the Louisiana Board of Regents for review by the Georgia Institute of Technology through the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, a position held by Dr. Charles L. Liotta. Total funding requested was \$1,643,756.

Dr. Charles L. Liotta received the following materials for review: (a) the fourteen proposals; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, etc.; (c) guidelines for submission of these proposals as a reference tool for reviewers; and (d) two separate rating forms, one for equipment requests and one for other than equipment requests.

Due to the diverse nature of these proposals, expert Georgia Tech reviewers were solicited for each of the proposals. See Table I for a listing of the reviewers. All of the reviews were returned to Dr. Liotta for submission to the Louisiana Board of Regents. This report contains two tables that rank all fourteen proposals. Table II contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Table III contains a rank-order list of proposals recommended for funding if additional funding becomes available. Table IV contains a rank-order list of proposals not recommended for funding. In the compilation of these tables, Dr. Liotta used the guidance listed on the rating forms that proposals with a total score below 70 would not be recommended for funding. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling \$950,000. 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
REVIEWER LIST WITH AFFILIATION

	Proposal Title	Reviewer	Unit
001MUL-07	Enhancement of the Dillard Visual Religious Art Program, Phase II	Philip Auslander	Literature, Comm. & Culture
002MUL-07	Creation of a Multimedia Presentation Classroom	Joel Jackson	Electrical & Computer Engineering
003MUL-07	Enhancement of Research in Materials Science and Physics through the Acquisition of Non-Destructive Investigative Equipment	Laurence Jacobs	Civil & Environmental Engineering
004MUL-07	Enhancing LSUS Science Undergraduates through High School Dual Enrollment Courses	Marion Usselman	CEISMC
005MUL-07	Hybrid Instruction in Multidisciplinary Settings to Advance Student Learning	Godfried Augenbroe	College of Architecture
006MUL-07	Enhancement of Micro/Nanotechnology Education with Hands-on Scanning Electron Microscopy	Peter Hesketh	Mechanical Engineering
007MUL-07	Expanding the Multi-disciplinary, Hands-on Teaching Experiences of the College of Engineering and Technology Through the Integration of Plant Process Training Equipment with Industrial Control Systems	Daniel Tedder	Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering
008MUL-07	Enhancing Education in Science and Engineering by Increasing the Functionality of a Cleanroom Laboratory	Levent Degertekin	Mechanical Engineering
009MUL-07	The Enhancement of Scanning Electron Microscopy Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Zhong Lin Wang	Materials Science & Engineering
010MUL-07	Networking Minorities Education in the Sciences and Humanities (N-MESH)	Reginald Desroches	Civil & Environmental Engineering
011MUL-07	A Consortium of University Performing Arts Programs: Creating a Resource Center for Period Costumes and Accessories	Kenneth J Knoespel	Literature, Comm. & Culture
012MUL-07	Acquisition of Magnetometer System to Support Existing Teaching and Research Programs	Hamid Garmestani	Materials Science & Engineering
013MUL-07	Development of Educational Video Gaming Research Infrastructure	Amy Bruckman	College of Computing
014MUL-07	Computational Cluster Enhancement	Tyler Walters	Library and Information Center

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	NUMBER	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	98	013-MUL-07	University of Louisiana, Lafayette	\$155,974	\$155,974
2	93	014-MUL-07	University of New Orleans	\$134,297	\$134,297
3	91	009-MUL-07	Southern University & A&M College, Baton Rouge	\$97,995	\$97,995
4	90	007-MUL-07	McNeese University	\$150,000	\$150,000
5	89	004-MUL-07	Louisiana State University-Shreveport	\$19,000	\$19,000
5	89	006-MUL-07	Louisiana Tech University	\$60,630	\$60,630
7	88	012-MUL-07	University of Louisiana, Lafayette	\$167,660	\$167,660
8	87	005-MUL-07	Louisiana State University-Shreveport	\$52,016	\$52,015
9	86	003-MUL-07	Louisiana State University & A&M College	\$120,452	\$112,429
TOTALS:				\$958,024	\$950,000

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES AVAILABLE**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NUMBER	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
10	85	010-MUL-07	Tulane University	\$121,148	\$121,148
11	80	001-MUL-07	Dillard University	\$60,422	\$60,422
12	79	008-MUL-07	Southern Univeristy & A&M College, Baton Rouge	\$150,000	\$150,000
TOTALS:				\$331,570	\$331,570

**TABLE IV
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	NUMBER	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	72	002-MUL-07	Louisiana State University & A&M College	\$101,680	\$0
2	63	011-MUL-07	University of Louisiana, Lafayette	\$252,483	\$0
			TOTALS:	\$354,163	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-07

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Alain P. Durocher

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of the Dillard Visual Religious Art Program,
Phase II

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 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (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 7 (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: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,422
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,422
 (If additional funds become available)

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

The panel is intrigued by the idea of developing a "smart gallery." Such a facility is certainly in step with current developments in the worlds of art and museums and would put Dillard in a visible position of leadership. Should the facility be used correctly, it would surely enhance teaching, learning, and community outreach, as well as the institution's overall prestige and ability to participate in artistic exchange and collaboration with other institutions. However, the proposal does not describe precisely how it will be used and why such a facility is what Dillard needs to accomplish the stated goals. It is surprising that no specific software is mentioned, since rather specific capabilities will be necessary to produce the kinds of exhibitions a smart gallery will enable. The absence of specific software requests suggests a lack of expertise in the technology and its uses in a smart gallery. The panel is concerned that there does not seem to be a faculty member with the specific expertise necessary to make the best use of such a facility. Neither is there any mention of hiring a gallery director to oversee its operation, surely a crucial necessity. There is mention of some staff support personnel who may possess related expertise, but the faculty profiles suggest that they will function primarily as "content providers." The list of functions and programs the smart gallery will serve seems a bit of a laundry list. The panel recommends funding only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kelly Blessinger

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Creation of a Multimedia Presentation Classroom

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 20 points)
 B.3 20 (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)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$101,680
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 work plan is clearly articulated and well written. The primary weakness of the proposal, however, is the limited scope of the types of media requested. For the amount of money requested, a significantly better multimedia room with video capability could be built. The need for such a room is real, but the proposal as is does not address the needs of students and faculty for the most commonly used modern media. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Eyassu Woldesenbet

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Research in Materials Science and Physics
Through the Acquisition of Non-Destructive Investigative
Equipment

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 86 (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 5 (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 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$120,452
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$112,429

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 Principal Investigators (PIs) are qualified and experienced researchers. The equipment requested is reasonable and well-budgeted. The panel suggests that the PIs consider alternative vendors such as Panametrics/Olympus for the C-scan system. There is no institutional match. Because of the limited funds available, partial funding is recommended with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nathan R. Hutchings

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing LSU-S Science Undergraduates Through High School Dual Enrollment Courses

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)

D.1 12 (of 12 points)

D. 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 10 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 20 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$19,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$19,000

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 is essentially a planning grant to help write the curriculum and create the evaluation instruments necessary to successfully implement two dual-enrollment courses to be taught at local high schools for credit at LSU-Shreveport. This planning is necessary in order to effectively document a standard of excellence that ensures that the high school students receive a high quality product akin to the equivalent course at LSU-Shreveport. The proposal is well conceived and written, and the personnel appear highly qualified to conduct the project. The panel questions whether this project will catapult the department to national prominence. However, the proposal requests a modest level of funding for an effort that might succeed in raising the level of academic achievement in the local high schools, and therefore improve the pipeline of incoming students. If successful, the project could be expanded to include additional schools in Louisiana. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: John Sigle

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Hybrid Instruction in Multidisciplinary Settings to Advance Student Learning

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 0 (of 2 points)
 E.2a _____ (For S/E)
 or _____ (of 10 points)
 E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$52,015
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$52,015

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 established online classroom technology. The work plan is solid and well written. The Principal Investigators (PIs) appear to be very capable. The panel is concerned that no concrete benchmarks for progress are given. Given the nature of this technology, the panel feels that this is a necessary aspect of the project. The technology is fairly standard and will allow the institution to keep up with current trends, but not necessarily catapult them into eminence. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-07

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Hisham E. Hegab

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Micro/Nanotechnology Education with Hands-on Scanning Electron Microscopy

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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:

89

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$60,630
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$60,630

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.)

Multiple courses will use the requested instrumentation, including Fundamentals of Nanosystems Engineering, Micro/Nanoscale Materials and Measurement and Analysis, Microsystem Design, Fabrication and Testing, and Materials Laboratory. In addition, an engineering outreach to Schools and Colleges is present. The proposal will operate in relation to other successful grants, such as one from the College of Engineering Science, supplemental funds from the Center for Entrepreneurship and Information Technology at Louisiana Tech, and a grant from the National Science Foundation's Undergraduate Education Development Program. This instrument will provide excellent resources such as hands-on experience for students and fits well with the direction for further growth and expansion of the interdisciplinary activities in nanotechnology. The Principal Investigator (PI) and team of faculty involved have excellent track records and experience in nanotechnology. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-07

INSTITUTION: McNeese University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jonathan Sullivan

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Expanding the Multidisciplinary, Hands-on Teaching Experiences of the College of Engineering and Technology Through the Integration of Plant Process Training Equipment with Industrial Control

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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 _____

H. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$150,000
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$150,000

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 is well conceived and well written. The authors have achieved substantial industrial support and the implementation of this proposal will significantly enhance the educational experience for students in a number of courses at McNeese. The panel is concerned that the requested funding level may not be adequate to completely install the proposed systems and, particularly as to whether the funding is adequate to completely install and interface the new equipment, and also to maintain the system. The panel is also concerned that additional staffing may be required to keep this system operational. A full-time effort is often required to maintain this software and keep the system operational, even after all hardware is installed, and it is not clear that adequate funds will be provided by the current request. Additional funding for maintenance and integration may be necessary. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MUL-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Fred Lacy

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing Education in Science and Engineering by
Increasing the Functionality of a Cleanroom Laboratory

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$150,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$150,000
 (If additional funds become available)

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

The requested equipment is an essential component of any microfabrication facility. There is some concern about utilization of these systems given the small size of the faculty and research activity level, but the panel is enthusiastic about the proposal's educational and training aspects. Exposure to and experience in microfabrication certainly makes a difference for students applying to graduate level programs in MEMS and ECE departments. Therefore, a lab course concentrated on making a simple device in a cleanroom will be very valuable. However, the link between the research and course and the particular equipment purchases is not clearly indicated. The research projects mentioned may or may not require the PECVD system. It is not clear that there are any new, planned projects that will use the new equipment. The equipment is reasonably priced but both systems are used and aged and, therefore, maintenance will be an issue. There is mention of a technician, but it is not clear if that person is a dedicated cleanroom technician. A strong commitment from the department was not evident in the proposal. Full funding is recommended should additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MUL-07

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

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Edwin H. Walker, Jr.

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Enhancement of Scanning Electron Microscopy
Capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 18 (of 20 points)
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 5 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes X No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 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: 91 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$97,995
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$97,995

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

The proposal is well-conceived and well-written. The requested equipment, a Scanning Electron Microscope, is an essential item for any institution supporting research. The Principal Investigators are successful researchers with good publishing records and external funding. The institutional match is relatively sizeable. Full funding is recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MUL-07

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Nghana Lewis

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Networking Minorities Education in the Sciences and
Humanities (N-MESH)

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)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

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

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

G. Total Score:

85

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$121,148

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$121,148

(if additional funds become available)

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

This is a very important project and the authors present a well conceived plan. However, due to a limited amount of funds, full funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MUL-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: A.C. "Buddy" Himes

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: A Consortium of University Performing Arts Programs:
Creating a Resource Center for Period Costumes and
Accessories

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. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 6 (of 12 points)

D. 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)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 19 (of 25 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 2 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No X

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No _____

G. Total Score:

63

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$252,483
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 funding to acquire costumes and accessories that will be shared between three collaborating departments of UL-Lafayette. Given the importance assigned to costume design itself in course work, it is striking that very little attention is given to the design and production of costumes within the proposal itself. Instead, the large part of the proposal is directed to the outright purchase of ready-made costumes. Instead of emphasizing the ways that purchased costumes might contribute to the design and production of costumes "in-house," the proposal appears to protect institutional funding from being expended on costume rental. Budget and convenience appear to drive the proposal rather than pedagogy. The proposal indicates that other Louisiana institutions have expressed interest in joining a consortium that would provide access to the costumes. While a consortium would certainly be desirable, little detail is provided regarding infrastructure of such a consortium or the necessary rental structure. The suggestion that the purchase of costumes for UL-Lafayette will enhance eco-tourism in the state is an engaging projection but unrealistic without a far more developed plan. Overall, an emphasis on the ways that a shared costume resource would enhance costume design and production within the participating units would improve the proposal. While the possession of a costume collection is desirable, it should be used to foster attention on the ongoing development faculty and student skills. Funding is not recommended.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MUL-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. D. K. Misra

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Magnetometer System to Support Existing Teaching and Research Programs

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

88

 (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 18 (of 20 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 1 (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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$167,660

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$167,660

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 the acquisition of a 'Superconducting Quantum Interference Device (SQUID) magnetometer' to support existing teaching and research programs at UL-Lafayette. This facility is a must for any science and engineering academic institution. At present there is no magnetic property measurement system available at UL-Lafayette. The lack of such a facility not only affects the training and education of undergraduate and graduate students in magnetic studies but it also makes it difficult to perform effective research in these areas. The acquisition of SQUID will have a significant and broad impact on teaching and research in all disciplines of engineering and sciences. The PIs are very reputable in their fields and are quite capable of managing and running the facility. The acquisition of this equipment will attract new students along with researchers from other institutions, create new collaborations with industry, and promote growth in new areas of science and technology. The institutional match is significant. The panel recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013MUL-07

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Douglas C. Williams

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Educational Video Gaming Research
Infrastructure

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)
D.1 12 (of 12 points)

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

G. Total Score: 98 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 19 (of 20 points)
B.3 24 (of 25 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes X No _____

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

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$155,974
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$155,974

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 potential impact of this proposal on UL-Lafayette is strong. However, the potential impact on students using the resulting software is less clear. In many ways the project is ambitious and experimental. However, the Principal Investigators possess strong qualifications and extensive track records. The panel feels this is worth the investment and recommends full funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014MUL-07

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Abdulrahman Alsamman

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Computational Cluster Enhancement

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 20 (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 _____

H. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$134,297

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$134,297

(If additional funds become available)

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

This proposal to more than double the capacity of UNO's parallel computing capabilities is a sound move forward to improve hands-on student experiences and faculty research capability . It will have a positive impact on the restoration of the Gulf Coast area and the economic development of the region. The potential to assist in various civil and environmental engineering projects in the area is made very clear. Excellent descriptions of research projects, governmental projects, and student courses that would benefit from the increase in parallel computing are provided. There are significant potential partnerships as evidenced by the letter of support. The panel is concerned that while the Principal Investigators make the case that building the new parallel computing capability on their own is less expensive, they do not address adequately how they will maintain this new capability over time. In addition, the cost estimates based on "internet pricing" are sketchy at best. It would be better to provide a documented quote from a trusted and known computer hardware provider. Full funding is recommended.

Appendix A

Summary of Proposals Submitted

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary
for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MUL -07	Enhancement of the Dillard Visual Religious Art Program, Phase II	Dillard University (Philosophy and Religion);	Alain P. Durocher; Amy Bryan; Gail E. Bowman; John Barnes;	1	\$ 60,422
				Total	\$ 60,422
E					
Proposal is a Continuation Request					
Previous Contract: LEQSF (2004-05)-ENH-TR-02					
Disciplines : Arts					
002MUL -07	Creation of a Multimedia Presentation Classroom	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Reference);	Kelly Blessinger; Faye Phillips;	1	\$ 101,680
				Total	\$ 101,680
N					
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines : Agricultural Sciences, Earth/Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, Health and Medical Sciences, Arts					

E=Primarily an Equipment Request

N=Not Primarily an Equipment Request

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003MUL -07	Enhancement of Research in Materials Science and Physics Through the Acquisition of Non-Destructive Investigative Equipment	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Mechanical Engineering);	Eyassu Woldesenbet; Guoqiang Li; Kenneth Matthews II; Phani Mylavarapu; Steve Cai;	1	\$ 120,452
E				Total	\$ 120,452
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					
004MUL -07	Enhancing LSUS Science Undergraduates Through High School Dual Enrollment Courses	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Biological Sciences);	Nathan R. Hutchings; Deborah K. Shepherd; Linda Easley;	1	\$ 19,000
N				Total	\$ 19,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Agricultural Sciences, Earth/Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, Health and Medical Sciences					
005MUL -07	Hybrid Instruction in Multidisciplinary Settings to Advance Student Learning	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Computer Science);	John Sigle; Deborah Shepherd; Gary Boucher; Tara Williams-Hart;	1	\$ 52,015
E				Total	\$ 52,015
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A, Health and Medical Sciences					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MUL -07	Enhancement of Micro/Nanotechnology Education with Hands-on Scanning Electron Microscopy	Louisiana Tech University (Nanosystems Engineering);	Hisham E. Hegab; Chad O'Neal; James Palmer;	1	\$ 60,630
E				Total	\$ 60,630
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					
007MUL -07	Expanding the Multi-disciplinary, Hands-on Teaching Experiences of the College of Engineering and Technology Through the Intergration of Plant Process Training Equipment with Industrial Control	McNeese State University (Engineering);	Jonathan Sullivan; Brent Garner; Carol Schulte; John Griffith; Therrill Valentine;	1	\$ 150,000
E				Total	\$ 150,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					
008MUL -07	Enhancing Education in Science and Engineering by Increasing the Functionality of a Cleanroom Laboratory	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Electrical Engineering);	Fred Lacy; Edward Doomes; Laurence Henry; Pradeep Bhattacharya; Walter Craig;	1	\$ 150,000
E				Total	\$ 150,000
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009MUL -07	The Enhancement of Scanning Electron Microscopy capabilities for Research and Teaching at Southern University	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Environmental Toxicology/Chemistry);	Edwin H. Walker, Jr.; Karen Crosby; Yadong Qi;	1 2	\$ 97,995 \$
E				Total	\$ 97,995
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Agricultural Sciences, Earth/Environmental Sciences					
010MUL -07	Networking Minorities Education in the Sciences and Humanities (N-MESH)	Tulane University (ADST/English);	Nghana Lewis; Sybil Schroeder;	1	\$ 121,148
N				Total	\$ 121,148
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Arts					
011MUL -07	A Consortium of University Performing Arts Programs: Creating a Resource Center for Period Costumes and Accessories	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Music);	A. C. Himes; Jacqueline Robeck; Neil Vanderpool; Shawn Roy;	1	\$ 252,483
N				Total	\$ 252,483
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Arts					

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012MUL -07	Acquisition of Magnetometer System to Support Existing Teaching and Research Programs	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Chemical Engineering);	R. D. K. Misra; M. Madani; R. S. Srivastava; R. S. Perkins;	1	\$ 167,660
E				Total	\$ 167,660
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					
013MUL -07	Development of Educational Video Gaming Research Infrastructure	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Innovative Learning and Assessment Technologies (CILAT));	Douglas C. Williams; Charles Richard; Louise Prejean; Timothy Roden; Yeon Choi; Yuxin Ma;	1	\$ 155,974
N				Total	\$ 155,974
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Arts					
014MUL -07	Computational Cluster Enhancement	University of New Orleans (Electrical Engineering);	Abdulrahman Alsamman; Ioannis Georgiou; John A. McCorquodale; Martin J. Guillot;	1	\$ 134,297
E				Total	\$ 134,297
Proposal is a New Request					
Disciplines (s): Engineering A					

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary for the FY 2006-2007 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
14	\$ 1,643,756	\$ 1,643,756	\$

Appendix B

Rating Forms

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

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

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____