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Introduction

The Humanities Review Panel consisting of Dr. Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Chair, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Iowa State University; and Dr. Samantha Cantrell, Grant Development Specialist, Middle Tennessee State University, met via phone conference on February 22, 2012, to evaluate twelve (12) 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 2008-09); and (4) the FY 2011-12 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program 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 support.

The twelve (12) Humanities proposals submitted in FY 2011-12 requested a total of $1,168,661 in first-year funds. Four (4) proposals were highly recommended for funding, two (2) of them at reduced levels.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding, together with the recommended funding levels. Table II contains a list of proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available. Table III contains a list of proposals not recommended for funding. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.
### TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>08HUM-12</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$47,792</td>
<td>$47,792</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>07HUM-12</td>
<td>SU-NO</td>
<td>$98,568</td>
<td>$61,899</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>05HUM-12</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$53,744</td>
<td>$53,744</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>09HUM-12</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$80,419</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>$280,523</td>
<td>$182,435</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12HUM-12</td>
<td>Xavier</td>
<td>$83,575</td>
<td>$41,327</td>
<td>$18,990</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>$83,575</td>
<td>$41,327</td>
<td>$18,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>First Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>First Year Funds Recommended</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Requested</th>
<th>Second Year Funds Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>04HUM-12</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$74,771</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,983</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>03HUM-12</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$29,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,550</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10HUM-12</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$266,596</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>06HUM-12</td>
<td>Loyola</td>
<td>$153,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$41,696</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>11HUM-12</td>
<td>UL-L</td>
<td>$159,352</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>01HUM-12</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$61,632</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$48,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>02HUM-12</td>
<td>LSU-BR</td>
<td>$59,050</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$49,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>$804,563</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$197,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This proposal seeks funding to digitize historical land grant surveys relevant to the State of Louisiana and the region. The project is compelling, the rationale is well justified, and the work plan is specific. The PIs are experienced researchers with track records of successful funded projects. Although well written, the proposal places too much focus on the PIs' scholarship rather than on how these activities will enhance the department, the curriculum, the students, and especially the faculty. The proposal did not fully develop how the end results of the PIs' work could be used for teaching with primary sources. Also lacking is a strategy for how the PIs might respond to unforeseen delays in the project. Finally, the applicants fail to note how this project might lead to partnerships outside the University, e.g., collaborations with museums or other archives. Funding is not recommended.
This is an ambitious plan to enhance an important program at LSU, the African American Studies Program. The proposal notes that this funding request is necessary to allow the program to continue to offer curricula and to remain viable. Such language suggests that funds are sought for basic support rather than to enhance the program. Minimal information is provided about the institutional context and how project activities will either enhance departments or units involved or complement existing resources at LSU. There is no indication in the work plan of what precisely the PIs plan to do, what the specific timeline is, who is responsible for what, and how each objective will be evaluated, which are all required details in the proposal. There is a very large amount of equipment requested. However, it is not clear how many students are enrolled in the program and would be served by the activities if the proposal is funded. Overall, although the program is a valued one, the PIs did not take care to address fully all of the components of the proposal narrative. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 03HUM-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dickens at LSU: Bicentennial and Beyond

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Elsie Michie

A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 66 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 19 (of 23 points)
B.3 20 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 6 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 1 (of 2 points)

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

F. Total Score: 78 (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: $29,600 $7,550
Recommended Amount: $0 $0

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

This proposal to support the Dickens Project at LSU-BR is well written and supported by passionate and well-qualified faculty. The current proposal builds on an earlier Dickens Project recommended for funding by this Panel in 2009 which resulted in an invitation to LSU-BR to form part of the national Dickens consortium. This two-year funding request aims to provide opportunities for both student and faculty development, such as attendance at the Dickens Universe Conference for two Ph.D. students and faculty members. In order to ensure community-wide impact, the PIs seek funds to support two major speakers on campus and a major public Dickens performance by an actor. Overall, this is a well-articulated and valuable project with a track record of success. However, the Panel does not support funding at this time because it is unclear whether this program and its relationship to national forums can become self-sustaining or if it will attempt to rely on continued BoRSF support. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04HUM-12

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Poetry and Pedagogy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Weinstein

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)
B.1 4.5 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 23 points)
B.3 20 (of 25 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 8 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No

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

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

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

F. Total Score: 79.5 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Amount:</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Amount:</td>
<td>$74,771</td>
<td>$49,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 well-written, exciting, and contemporary proposal that builds on the PI's past BoRSF-funded projects on the spoken word movement. The PI and related personnel are highly qualified to carry out the proposed work. The project has potential not only to enhance learning for undergraduate and graduate students at LSU-BR, but also to make an impact on the broader community and K-12 education. The proposal's major weakness is a lack of specificity. It would be stronger if the work plan were further developed with all of the required components (who, what, when, how measured, etc.), particularly for benchmarks and evaluation. An institutional match for some of the personnel costs would strengthen this request as well. It is also unclear why it is necessary to pay a staff member at WordPlay to be a community liaison. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05HUM-12

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing the Technical Writing Lab at Louisiana Tech University: A Green Solution

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Roach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 56 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes</td>
<td>B.1 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 16 (of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 17 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Equipment</th>
<th>D. Faculty and Staff Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 6 (of 6 points)</td>
<td>D.1 12 (of 12 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 3 (of 3 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</th>
<th>E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>E.1 1 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or (of 10 points)</td>
<td>or (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)</td>
<td>E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Total Score: 87 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Requested Amount: $53,744

Recommended Amount: $53,744

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 well-written proposal seeks to enhance the Technical Writing Lab administered by the Department of English. The department offers undergraduate and graduate instruction in technical communication, a discipline central to the University's mission. New equipment and software are needed to improve the instructional environment within the department's dedicated computer lab, which serves 800-1,000 students per year. The department offers an online graduate certificate in Technical Writing, which will also be impacted positively by the overall upgrade in the technology infrastructure. The goals, work plan, and assessment measures are clearly detailed. The PI seeks funds for the purchase of 25 all-in-one computers; upgraded software; and technology resources to equip one Smart Classroom. This modest request for one year will significantly impact the quality of instruction for students. Funding is recommended in full.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06HUM-12

INSTITUTION: Loyola University New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancing through Innovation: Creating a Documentary and Oral History Studio at Loyola

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Justin Nystrom

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 17 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No

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

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E) (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requested Amount: $153,562</td>
<td>$41,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Amount: 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 create a documentary and oral history studio is an ambitious project with a well-qualified PI. The project will enable implementation of a methodologically state-of-the-art film-based oral and documentary history curriculum that will enhance the department's reputation. It will benefit students through technological training so that they are more competitive as they seek employment. The Panel's primary concern is the cost, which seems prohibitively high considering how narrowly defined the program content is. As proposed, the studio will have 16 professional-quality video editing workstations and filming field kits. The very high investment in professional-grade equipment is not justified given the narrow scope of the audience and the potential impact. Students majoring in history will certainly be trained more meaningfully in the methodology of documentary source collection and interpretation, but there is no realistic need for them to be engaged in professional-quality video editing. The Panel recommends that a more modest request be submitted in the future to pilot the PI's vision before seeking such substantial funding. Funding is not recommended.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07HUM-12

INSTITUTION: Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Strengthening MA in Museum Studies Program Students, Faculty and Curricula through Researching Artifact Exhibition Methods

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Yu Jiang

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 16 (of 18 points)
B.3 19 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 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)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 1.5 (of 2 points)
E.2a For S/E
E.2b For NS/NE

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

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: $98,568

RECOMMENDATIONS
Recommended Amount: $61,899

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 well-written and compelling proposal to strengthen Museum Studies at SUNO, the only such program in the state. The program clearly fills a statewide and regional need. The project objectives are well defined and specific benchmarks in the work plan are outlined for each aspect of the project. Because the PIs indicate that more than half of the Museum Studies graduate students pursue the degree online, we do question how some of the assets for hands-on learning will benefit them directly, although there is sufficient evidence of potential impact beyond that specific program. The proposal lists guest lecturers and summer stipends for students in its budget, but these are not mentioned in the narrative. While the various components of this proposal all have value, the Panel recommends partial funding of $61,899, solely for the purchase of equipment. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately. Finally, the PI and co-PI submitted a BoRSF proposal to the Multidisciplinary competition that greatly overlapped with this proposal, including duplicate requests for summer support, student assistants, funding for speakers, and equipment. Neither PI disclosed the dual BoRSF requests as required. In the future, the PIs should adhere to required disclosure rules and the prohibition of duplicate requests for support, particularly given the limited funding available to support all deserving BoRSF projects.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 08HUM-12

**INSTITUTION:** University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Building a Competitive Post-Production Facility

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Heidi Bordogna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
<td>(Total of 56 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes      X No</td>
<td>B.1 5 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 17 (of 18 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 19 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 10 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 5.5 (of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2 1 (of 1 point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3 3 (of 3 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact</th>
<th>F. Previous Support Fund Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>(No Points Assigned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 2 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>G.1 Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Total Score:</th>
<th>(of 100 points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- **Requested Amount:** $47,792
- **Recommended Amount:** $47,792

**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 a well-written proposal for a post-production facility that will serve a broad range of students and disciplines for the modest amount of funding requested. The proposal builds on and intersects with the film industry in Louisiana, which ranks third nationally in the amount of film production it supports. The Department of Communication aims to be a leader in providing the State with highly trained post-production professionals equipped to support this growth industry. The proposal makes a strong case for both the academic and cultural/economic benefits of this enhancement investment. The PIs seek funds to enhance and upgrade the technology facilities available to students enrolled in the department's production courses and through the new Moving Image Arts program. The upgrade is necessary as well to keep the program in alignment with the accrediting standards of the ACEJMC. The budget includes requests for hardware (29 iMacs, the industry standard) and software (29 licenses for Final Cut Pro). UL-L is providing the faculty/staff time to support the work proposed. The Panel recommends fully funding this proposal.
The Panel recommends partial funding of $19,000 to support fully the graduate assistants and to support partially either salary support for Co-PI Amanda LaFleur or support for the consultants, whichever will enable the project to move forward most effectively. Both LaFleur and consultants appear to be engaged in the needed transcription work/review, so this is the area in which the Panel believes support is most critical. Should further monies become available, funding of $47,609 is recommended, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the PI.
**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 10HUM-12

**INSTITUTION:** University of Louisiana at Lafayette

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Our Memory, Our History: Embracing the African American Past

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Derek Mosley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. The Current Situation (Total of 10 Points)</th>
<th>B. The Enhancement Plan (Total of 62 Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes X No</td>
<td>B.1 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 18 (of 23 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 19 (of 25 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise (Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>B.4 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1 12 (of 12 points)</td>
<td>B.5 1 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact (Total of 12 Points)</td>
<td>B.6 5 (of 6 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 2 (of 2 points)</td>
<td>B.7 Yes X No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2a (For S/E)</td>
<td>F.1 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or D.2b (For NS/NE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL SCORE:** 78 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:**

| Requested Amount: $266,596 |
| 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 project to enhance the Ernest J. Gaines Center at UL-L is highly ambitious, involving 15 academic departments. While the Center is primarily focused on a single author (Gaines) at the present time, the proposal seeks funding to enhance the collection by purchasing manuscripts, books, and archival and digital resources on African American literature, history, and culture. The PIs incorporate a high school outreach component through curriculum development which will enhance the visibility of UL-L and the Gaines Center in the community, an approach the Panel strongly supports. The idea to establish a strong research center is a laudable one, but the acquisition of materials may have to proceed at a more gradual pace than this proposal suggests. The total amount of funding requested by the PIs far exceeds the pool of available funding for all Humanities proposals. Funding is not recommended.
The mission of the Center for Cultural and Eco-Tourism (CCET) is to document and preserve regional traditions. One of its key collections is the Archives of Cajun and Creole Folklore (ACCF), a site of increased research and consultation. The server on which rare linguistic resources of the ACCF are preserved is in dire condition, and there is an entirely insufficient back-up mechanism in place should the server become inoperable. The PI seeks funding to enhance data storage capacity and security for these unique linguistic and cultural resources. Of the funding requested, approximately 25% will be used for student support with the remainder to be used for the purchase of equipment, which the Panel believes is a reasonable budget. However, the work plan as articulated does not provide enough details of the activities to be undertaken, the responsible individuals, the schedule of activities, the benchmarks, or the evaluation mechanisms to be used. Without a clear work plan, the Panel does not recommend funding.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12HUM-12

INSTITUTION: Xavier University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Proposal for a Xavier University of Louisiana Multi-Media, Multi-Purpose Language Learning Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Susan Spillman

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)
A.1 Yes X No
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 4 (of 5 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 18 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 5 (of 6 points)
B.7 Yes X No

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 4 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

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

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact
(Total of 12 Points)
E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (For NS/NE)

G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUESTED</th>
<th>AMOUNT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>$83,575</td>
<td>$18,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>$41,327</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If additional monies 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.)

Language instruction in the 21st century is characterized by access to and use of electronic resources in the target language and, as appropriate, in English. This project proposes the introduction of a virtual lab environment into the infrastructure of the Department of Languages with an immediate and positive impact on students and faculty. In the physical lab, students have a "hands-on" experience; in the virtual lab as proposed, students will engage in learning via a remote connection, an activity not unfamiliar to our highly wired students. The Confucius Institute proposal being prepared by Xavier, as well as the introduction of less commonly taught languages into the curriculum, will necessitate that improved technological resources be made available to students and instructors. In fact, without upgraded technology and infrastructure, Xavier faces the possibility that it will not be eligible for either the Confucius Institute or other grant competitions because it does not meet the current industry standard. There is no institutional match. Due to very limited resources, funding for year one equipment only is recommended if additional monies become available.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Equipment/Non</th>
<th>New/Continuation</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001HUM-12</td>
<td>Hoffman, Paul</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing Historical Study of Late 18th Century Spanish Louisiana by Digitally Reuniting the Trudeau Land Grant Surveys Archive</td>
<td>$61,632.00 $48,600.00 $110,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002HUM-12</td>
<td>Jackson, Joyce</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Africana Research, Engagement and Lecture Series</td>
<td>$59,050.00 $49,700.00 $108,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003HUM-12</td>
<td>Michie, Elsie</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dickens at LSU: Bicentennial and Beyond</td>
<td>$29,600.00 $7,550.00 $37,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004HUM-12</td>
<td>Weinstein, Susan</td>
<td>Louisiana State University And A&amp;M College - Baton Rouge</td>
<td>2 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poetry and Pedagogy</td>
<td>$74,771.00 $49,983.00 $124,754.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005HUM-12</td>
<td>Roach, Susan</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>1 E N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing the Technical Writing Lab at Louisiana Tech University: A Green Solution</td>
<td>$53,744.00 $0.00 $53,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006HUM-12</td>
<td>Nystrom, Justin</td>
<td>Loyola University New Orleans</td>
<td>2 E N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enhancing through Innovation: Creating a Documentary and Oral History Studio at Loyola</td>
<td>$153,562.00 $41,696.00 $195,258.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007HUM-12</td>
<td>Jiang, Yu</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College at New Orleans</td>
<td>1 E N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening MA in Museum Studies Program Students, Faculty and Curricula through Researching Artifact Exhibition Methods</td>
<td>$98,568.00 $0.00 $98,568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008HUM-12</td>
<td>Bordogna, Heidi</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1 E N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Building a Competitive Post-Production Facility</td>
<td>$47,792.00 $0.00 $47,792.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009HUM-12</td>
<td>Lindner, Tamara</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>UL Lafayette Cajun and Creole French Language Reservoir Project</td>
<td>$80,419.00 $0.00 $80,419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010HUM-12</td>
<td>Mosley, Derek</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1 NE N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our Memory, Our History: Embracing the African American Past</td>
<td>$266,596.00 $0.00 $266,596.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011HUM-12</td>
<td>Ritter, Jennifer</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>1 E N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lâche Pas 2.0: Expanding Data Storage and Security</td>
<td>$159,352.00 $0.00 $159,352.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Number</td>
<td>PI Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Equipment/Non</td>
<td>New/Continuation</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012HUM-12</td>
<td>Spillman, Susan</td>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Proposal for a Xavier University of Louisiana Multi-Media, Multi-Purpose Language Learning Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Proposals submitted</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested for First Year</td>
<td>$1,168,661.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested for Second Year</td>
<td>$216,519.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Money Requested</td>
<td>$1,385,180.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Rating Forms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. THE CURRENT SITUATION</td>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
<td>A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
<td>A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN</td>
<td>56 points</td>
<td>B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 pts.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 pts.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 pts.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 pts.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 pts.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount $ ____________________  Recommended Amount $ ____________________

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: ______________________________________________________

Reviewer's Signature: ___________________________ Date: _______________ (Form 6.11 rev 2011)
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011-12
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 66 points

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

_____ of 23 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?

_____ of 25 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?

_____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?

_____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?

_____ of 6 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

   YES  NO  E.1  If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

   ______ of 100 points
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount: $___________________________
Recommended Amount: $________________________

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: __________________________________________________________

Reviewer's Signature: ___________________________________________ Date: ________________

(Form 6.12. rev.2011)