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INTRODUCTION

A review panel consisting of Dr. P. Jonathan Patchett, University of Arizona, chair; and Dr. Kevin Mickus, Missouri State University, communicated via phone and e-mail for the purpose of evaluating nineteen (19) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the conference: a) nineteen (19) Earth and Environmental Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, principal investigators, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2015-16 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals (RFP); and d) the FY 2012-13 Traditional Enhancement Report in the Earth and Environmental Sciences.

Prior to the review, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the fifteen proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and the reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP.

Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding, with recommended funding levels. Proposals recommended for funding if additional monies become available are listed in Table II. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table III. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not highly recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 91. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For many proposals in Tables I and II, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations. The partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget, which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling $2,074,534 were submitted in Earth and Environmental Sciences. The review panel recommended first-year awards totaling $525,328.
# 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>97</td>
<td>03EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$116,227</td>
<td>$101,227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>07EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$91,600</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18EAR-16</td>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$153,969</td>
<td>$139,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14EAR-16</td>
<td>LUMCON</td>
<td>$174,550</td>
<td>$44,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$89,889</td>
<td>$52,359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15EAR-16</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>13EAR-16</td>
<td>LaTech</td>
<td>$75,029</td>
<td>$51,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>$781,264</td>
<td>$525,328</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING BECOMES 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>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>04EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$58,300</td>
<td>$58,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>06EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$134,250</td>
<td>$131,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$106,490</td>
<td>$17,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>09EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$329,177</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>08EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$79,736</td>
<td>$79,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19EAR-16</td>
<td>ULM</td>
<td>$65,650</td>
<td>$65,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16EAR-16</td>
<td>Nicholls</td>
<td>$105,236</td>
<td>$105,236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUS</td>
<td>$34,176</td>
<td>$34,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>$913,015</td>
<td>$591,908</td>
<td>$0</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>16</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>01EAR-16</td>
<td>BRCC</td>
<td>$38,174</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>05EAR-16</td>
<td>LSUA&amp;M</td>
<td>$191,955</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17EAR-16</td>
<td>Nunez</td>
<td>$80,351</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>02EAR-16</td>
<td>Delgado</td>
<td>$69,775</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>$380,255</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This proposal seeks to create a five-year comprehensive sustainability plan for Baton Rouge Community College. The PI will accomplish this plan by a variety of methods including developing a college-wide ecological footprint, constructing a sustainability model, managing recycling services, trying to identify courses where sustainability can be included, creating a sustainability course, and creating a webpage of sustainability resources. The budget request is mainly allocated for travel to two conferences ($3,424) and to contract a company to create six online courses with the help of faculty ($30,000). Additional funding ($2,500) is requested to assess the courses. Sustainability is important and the students should be introduced to it; however, no substantial reason for the need to attend the conferences is given, or for why the outside contractor is needed to develop the courses. The web-related work may be somewhat demanding, but some documentation of why it could not be performed by faculty would have helped the proposal. Funding is not recommended.
### The Creation and Implementation of the Welcome Military and Transfer [MAT] Services

This proposal seeks to develop a program that assists military personnel with entering community colleges and in eventually transferring to four-year programs. Additionally, it will assist military personnel in aligning military training and education with the appropriate courses. The funds requested will be used mainly for kiosks, computers, software and salary for a program developer. Approximately half of the money will be used for the program developer, which the college has committed to retain and fund after the completion of the program. The only information related to a work plan for the project was embedded in a table under the goals and objectives section, which resulted in a rather abbreviated documentation of personnel and activities to implement the work. While need for the program is demonstrated, and it would have a major benefit for the numerous ex-military in the region, there is no significant mention how the program is related to earth and environmental sciences. The panel does not recommend funding.
This proposal seeks an optical Inductively-Coupled Plasma (ICP-OES) facility for the Departments of Geography and Anthropology. The lead PI is an extremely active researcher into coral paleoenvironments, and the ICP-OES would principally measure coral calcium, magnesium and strontium to make environmental reconstructions. Strong cases are made that the equipment is necessary for the departments to remain competitive in research and education, and that students need direct training in the analytical methods rather than waiting for data from outside labs. The cost of obtaining data from beyond LSU argues strongly for an in-house capability. Impact on student research and training as well as on class projects appears to be considerable. The institution is prepared to undertake laboratory modifications for the equipment, but it is surprising that these costs are not listed as matching funds. Plans for housing and maintenance of the facility within the existing archeology laboratory appear adequate. Partial funding of $101,227 is recommended for the main instrument and its necessary input and control devices, but not the supplies. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
### PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04EAR-16

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Acquisition of a Wavelength Dispersive Spectrometer for the JEOL 8230 Electron Microprobe at LSU: Implications for Research and Teaching of Solid (Geo)Materials

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Darrell Henry

#### A. The Current Situation

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. The Enhancement Plan

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>10 (of 10 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>18 (of 21 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Equipment

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

#### D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

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

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>2 (of 2 points)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a</td>
<td>9 (For S/E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### F. Previous Support Fund Awards

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:** $58,300

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:** $58,300

(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 seeks an additional X-ray analysis spectrometer in the Department of Geology and Geophysics. A new electron microprobe purchased in 2015 was funded by a gift from Chevron, but it was sufficient only to acquire a probe with three wavelength-dispersive spectrometers. A typical probe has four or six spectrometers, and having only three limits analysis capabilities and run durations. The Chevron grant, as well as the cooperative arrangement with the manufacturer JEOL, are strong evidences of industrial collaboration and sponsorship. The equipment is housed in a shared analytical facility, with dedicated technician support. The probe, a unique facility in Louisiana, will be used by a large number of earth science faculty and their students, and will also be employed in class projects. In a lean funding environment, the panel is forced to note that the probe facility is fully operational with state-of-the-art equipment, and while the lack of one spectrometer is certainly a moderate hindrance to research projects, the proposal must have a slightly lower priority because its need is less urgent. The panel recommends full funding if additional funds become available.
This proposal requests a benchtop X-ray Fluorescence (XRF) spectrometer and related sample preparation devices, plus a sample introduction interface (Seafast) for an existing Inductively-Coupled Plasma (ICP) spectrometer. Specific details are lacking in several important areas throughout the proposal. It is not clear how the equipment will specifically be used in the PI's projects, and what dimensions it will add. A somewhat clear description of the fusion setup and the microwave digestion only appears in a table contained in the Project Goals and Objectives section. However, the need for fusion before XRF analysis is not explained, and the benefits of microwave sample digestion (as opposed to the much cheaper option of vessels on a hotplate) is not detailed. There is no clear description of the Seafast sample interface in the proposal. A discussion of the capabilities of the instrument is not provided. How does it complement the PI's existing elemental analysis by ICP, and what does the XRF add, considering the laboratory already has elemental analysis? Classes are mentioned, but there are no indications how the equipment would be used in class exercises. Criteria and steps for project evaluation are vague. Funding is not recommended.
This proposal requests funds to purchase a multibeam sonar system to image shallow river and coastal channel characteristics and bathymetry, and sediment flow into coastal regions. The determination of channel characteristics and bathymetry will aid in developing plans for coastal restoration and assessing storm damage. The PI has published significant papers on channel characteristics, studied by similar equipment to that requested here. The proposal outlines numerous applications for the equipment in existing courses and student research projects, indicating that the requested equipment will be put to good use. The institution does supply minimal funding support for installation. It is not quite clear from the proposal what the depth limitations of the equipment and boats are. If human-powered kayak deployment were necessary in many channels and bays, then projects might be cumbersome, even if many students could participate. The panel recommends funding if additional funds become available for the sonar unit, but not the supplies. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07EAR-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of Automated Surface Craft to Enhance Real-time Coastal Environmental Observations

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Chunyan Li

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 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 20 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 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)

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

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

G. Total Score: 96 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $91,600
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $90,000

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

This proposal requests funds to build an autonomous survey platform for the Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences. With the addition of two sensor units, the floating platform will be used to measure bathymetry, temperature, currents, turbidity and salinity in coastal Louisiana, and can also carry water samplers (which the PI will develop) and other equipment. Existing bathymetry data are largely out of date, and do not incorporate the effect of erosion and deposition in storms. The platform will be designed, constructed and tested by a technician with experience of building autonomous crafts for the PI's research. The potential of this innovative device is significant: not only can shallow-water bathymetry data be collected to replace ancient charts, but instrumentation can be carried by the boat to enhance future projects. Educational use has high potential, but a few more details could have been given of the student projects that are envisaged. This proposal was ranked highly in 2013, but not funded due to budget reductions. Relation of the work to industrial entities is documented by letters of support, and relevance to coastal resources and environmental change in Louisiana is considerable. The panel recommends partial funding of $90,000, though no funds are recommended for shipping and testing trips. The institutional match, which consists only of indirect costs, may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Mechanistic Understanding of Ocean Acidification and Carbon Fluxes in Marine and Coastal Systems - A Tool for Research and Education

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kanchan Maiti

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 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 16 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 6 (of 6 points)
C.2 0 (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 10 Points)
E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 10 (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 85 (of 100 points)
(Note: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $79,736
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $79,736
(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 requests funding for a Cavity Ring-Down Spectroscope in the Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences. The instrument will address research topics including the fate of organic carbon from wetlands, ocean acidification, and hypoxia. The PIs are very active researchers in these areas, and the research questions are presented well. The relevance to Louisiana's economy is strong. However, several proposal sections lack important details. Specific examples of student exercises are not provided. The work plan does not indicate how the equipment will be acquired, evaluated and deployed; the text in this section consists mainly of a reiteration of the research questions. It is not clear how large the equipment is, if there are any challenges to its field deployment, or how it will be physically supported and powered in the field. The section on Equipment on Hand for Project does not describe other department facilities that might complement its use (e.g. boats, ship time, other analytical facilities). Both the Project Evaluation and Equipment Housing and Maintenance sections lack important details. Full funding is recommended only if additional funds become available.
This proposal requests funds for the creation of LSU ScienceNET, a high-speed software-defined network that will enhance the Southern Regional Climate Center, a consortium of six southern universities performing climate information handling and research. The equipment requested includes a series of servers and switches needed to store and provide climate data to users over high bandwidth servers. The ability to store numerous large databases and stream these databases to users in a reasonable timeframe is useful for several types of research. The proposal would have benefited from specific examples of how the equipment would be used to benefit classroom activities and student research. The PI, while a director of the center and a past department chair, has modest publication activity. One Co-PI has active climate research; others do not but instead have engineering and systems experience, giving them the ability to maintain the network. The requested amount is high and represents 60% of available funds. Partial funding of $100,000 is recommended if additional funds become available, with reductions to be made at the PI's discretion. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
Adding Forensic Capabilities to the Center for Excellence in Palynology

Sophie Warny

<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 66 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Yes x No</td>
<td>B.1 7 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 16 (of 20 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 8 (of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 7 (of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5 8 (of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6 6 (of 8 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7 4 (of 4 points)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Faculty and Staff Expertise</th>
<th>D. 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>C.1 11 (of 12 points)</td>
<td>D.1 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.2a 9 (For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 9 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D.2b (For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Previous Support Fund Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No Points Assigned)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F. Total Score: 88 (of 100 points) |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $106,490
Recommended Amount: $17,560 (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 requests funding to develop forensic palynology in the Department of Geology and Geophysics. Pollen would be recovered from over 250 mammalian pelts stored at US museums in order to establish pollen maps to aid in US government security investigations. The PI and students have conducted successful pilot forensic studies with Mexican pelts from their own museum. Potential for future contract work is high, in several areas besides national security, perhaps with high visibility and recognition. Previous BoRSF awards to the PI have been successfully executed. While the PI has presumably selected specimens that have not spent time in other collections and will also monitor possible pollen contamination in the repository museums, it is not clear how contamination of the artifacts in transit from the original collecting sites will be ruled out. The need for the ductal fume hood should be better documented. No product model is specified and the proposal does not state what chemicals need to be extracted by the hood, or the type of filtration that the ductless hood would have. The request for PI salary is not justified in the proposal, and the work plan contains few details of what the postdoctoral student and the PI will do. The panel recommends funding for the travel and sample processing costs if funds become available. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Acquisition of Acoustic and Optical Sensors to Enhance the Research and Teaching of Sediment Diversion and Coastal Restoration

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kehui Xu

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  9 (of 10 points)
B.2  20 (of 21 points)
B.3  5 (of 5 points)
B.4  5 (of 5 points)
B.5  5 (of 5 points)
B.6  5 (of 5 points)
B.7  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)

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

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

G. Total Score: 93 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $89,889
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $52,359

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

This proposal seeks acoustic and optical backscatter sensors to enhance sediment investigations in diversion basins around the Mississippi Delta. These sensors have the potential to aid in understanding the river flow as it enters the Gulf of Mexico and contribute to knowledge supporting channel diversion and reclamation policies. Strong cases were made for research and educational applications for the equipment. The proposal was submitted in 2013 and was ranked fifth but was not funded in a lean budget year. The main criticism was the PI's lack of publications and he has remedied it by publishing several peer-reviewed papers. However, this year the PI asks for approximately double the previous amount with the addition of more sensors. The panel recommends funding for the acoustic backscatter instrument, the high sediment concentration and temperature sensors (OBS-5+ and OBS-3A), and the two wave gauge sensors. No funding is recommended for the velocimeters and supplies. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 12EAR-16

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University in Shreveport

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Providing Louisiana State University in Shreveport Students with Field-Rich Training in Marine Conservation

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Amy Erickson

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 66 Points)
B.1 7 (of 10 points)
B.2 12 (of 20 points)
B.3 7 (of 8 points)
B.4 7 (of 8 points)
B.5 7 (of 8 points)
B.6 7 (of 8 points)
B.7 4 (of 4 points)

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

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

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

F. Total Score: 81 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $34,176
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $34,176
(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 seeks to conduct field trips to the Louisiana coast and Florida Keys as part of a four-hour course in marine conservation. The request includes travel plus supplies to collect and store marine organisms. The PI has obtained funds from a previous BoRSF award to conduct a field trip to the Louisiana coast, in collaboration with LUMCON. That grant did lead to additional grants to support additional field trips. While this proposal states the course is in marine conservation, the proposed activities seem to be mainly biological in nature and there is no substantive mention of how the collection of organisms will be used to study environmental problems. As the field trips become wider-ranging and more expensive compared to the 2010 award, it seems legitimate to ask for a strong environmental component in the work if it is to be funded. The exposure of students to different field environments will be beneficial especially if environmental problems are addressed. The publication record of the PI is not substantial and no publications resulted from the previous grant. The panel recommends full funding only if additional funds become available.
This proposal requests 25 binocular microscopes plus one demonstration scope for teaching. The demonstration microscope allows projection of instructor-generated material. The scopes will be used for biology but also significant environmental science teaching in a growing program with 20 students. Ten class microscopes exist, but they are decades old, insufficient in number, and lack magnification. Eventually, however, binocular microscopes are a basic piece of equipment, and the existing scopes can continue to be used productively. The proposal is well written and convincing in almost all areas, though the equipment requested should be noted in the project summary. The PIs have been active in research but this proposal does not seem to mention any specific research projects involving students other than a casual mention of undergraduate research. Significant matching funds are provided for peripheral items, and this is a plus for the proposal. It appears that 15 binocular microscopes would be adequate for current needs. Partial funding of $51,892 is recommended. The demonstration microscope is essential for project goals and must be included, though all other reductions may be made at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.
INSTITUTION: Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Capabilities to Analyze Environmental Changes in Louisiana’s Coastal Ecosystems

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Brian Roberts

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 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment (Total of 10 Points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

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

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

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

G. Total Score: 94 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $174,550
RECOMMENDED AMOUNT: $44,350

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

This proposal seeks to acquire two microbalances and a Membrane-Inlet Mass Spectrometer (MIMS). The microbalances would replace equipment that is no longer functional, and would serve many important research objectives. MIMS would enable state-of-the-art measurements of dissolved gases in waters to address problems such as hypoxia and denitrification. Evolution of coastal environments like the Delta region are of great importance given climate change and other ecological developments. The PIs are all very active in research and training, and the Marine Center provides an important service for Louisiana universities and outreach to K-12. The balances seem to be an acute need, given that precise weighing must sometimes be performed off site. MIMS would enhance the center’s capacities, though the researchers and projects are somewhat loosely defined at present. The description of prior BoRSF awards is too brief, and gives no context in relation to the present proposal, or any indication of impact and success for those grants. Partial funding of $44,350 for the balances is recommended, with full funding for the MIMS facility recommended only if additional funds become available. The matching funds for new test weights for the balances should be maintained.
INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Water Quality Sampling Equipment to Enhance Environmental Biology Research and Teaching at Nicholls State University

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Christopher Bonvillain

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 9 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 5 (of 5 points)
B.6 5 (of 5 points)
B.7 5 (of 5 points)

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

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise
(Total of 12 Points)
D.1 11 (of 12 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 1 (of 10 points)
E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

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

G. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT: $80,000
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $46,000

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 seeks updated sonde equipment for field measurement of water quality for biology studies. The request includes four stationary, long-term sondes, one handheld sonde, and a tablet computer for receiving and interpreting data. A main area of emphasis for the PIs is fisheries, and existing older handheld devices cannot record chlorophyll and turbidity, which are critical parameters for fish and crayfish ecology. Although the root department is biology, environmental issues are prominent in many of the courses taught. While the two existing handheld sondes are described as aging, the proposal does not state their age or model. The proposal makes strong cases for research use, class use, and relevance to the local economy. The proposal does not address the question of why four locatable long-term measuring devices are needed, rather than a lesser number. Two strategically placed measuring stations might achieve close to the same results in the projects described, and would certainly satisfy educational requirements. There is no institutional match. The panel recommends partial funding for two stationary sondes, the handheld YSI ProDSS, and the Toughbook computer, but not for supplies.
This proposal requests equipment for aquatic chemistry research and teaching in biology. A new gas chromatograph mass spectrometer, Hach spectrometer and two incubator tanks would replace 15-year old units. These pieces are essential components of research and training in aquatic chemistry and biochemistry. A substantial institutional match is very positive. The proposal would benefit from added details on research and class use. While the proposal makes clear that exposure of students to new equipment would be very desirable, and faculty efficiency and morale improved, it does not describe any research or teaching applications that are severely disadvantaged or impossible with the current laboratories. What could the new equipment do that the current equipment cannot? This suggests a lower priority for the request. Full funding is recommended if funds become available.
RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 17EAR-16

INSTITUTION: Nunez Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Learning to Fish

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Stephen Waddell

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)

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 56 Points)
B.1 6 (of 10 points)
B.2 12 (of 21 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)
C.1 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 points)

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

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

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

G. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:
Requested Amount: $80,351
Recommended Amount: $0

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

This proposal requests funds to purchase six aquaculture ponds and associated materials including plants and animal life. These ponds will enhance a recently acquired greenhouse to aid in teaching students in environmental sciences and will help in replacing facilities lost during Hurricane Katrina. However, while students may receive some benefit from having these farms, there is no indication of how the students will engage in environmental sciences. Beyond the hands-on experience that the proposal emphasizes, there is essentially no information given about what exercises the students would do in their labs. There are no details or any indication of why the specific plants and animals were requested. A detailed plan on how all the requested items would fit into student classes and labs would have helped the proposal. Additionally, the proposal discusses little earth or environmental science but is mostly biology and might better fit in that category. The panel does not recommend funding.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Integrating Research and Education through Continuous Atmospheric Temperature and Moisture Profiles

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Todd Murphy

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 10 (of 10 points)
B.2 19 (of 21 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 5 (of 5 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 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)

B.5 4 (of 5 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 10 (For S/E)
or
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No N/A

G. Total Score: 95 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: $153,969
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: $139,500

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

This proposal requests funds for a microwave profiler radiometer and an automatic positioner for the radiometer. These instruments, roof-mounted, will be used to measure rapidly evolving low-level atmospheric temperature and water vapor profiles, and are needed for understanding convective weather systems, a current area of research of this group. The PI is a new faculty member and has started a research program that shows considerable promise. The instrument will be used for undergraduate research and education in atmospheric science. However, the proposal could have provided more concrete details of educational applications. The institution will purchase several pieces of equipment and software as a match. The cost of the main instrument is high relative to available funds and it is hoped that funding from another source could support the very important positioning device, which enables the radiometer to be pointed in non-vertical orientations. The panel recommends partial funding of $139,500 for the radiometer. The institutional match should be maintained in full.
INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Earth and Environmental Science on a Sphere

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Thomas Sasek

<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 8 (of 10 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 4 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.2 18 (of 21 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 5 (of 5 points)</td>
<td>B.3 4 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5 5 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6 3 (of 5 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7 4 (of 5 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 9 (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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Total of 12 Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 2 (of 2 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2a 9 (For S/E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For NS/NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

| G. Total Score: 84 (of 100 points) |

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: $65,650
Recommended Amount: $65,650

(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 seeks to acquire funds to purchase a digital globe called Magic Planet that displays animated information about the Earth's lands, oceans and atmosphere. The data can be used in a variety of applications and lessons to expose the audience to science and geography. The digital globe is planned to be used in introductory science classes to encourage students to pursue science careers. Additionally, it will be housed in the ULM Museum of Natural History so that the general public and K-12 school groups can use it and enhance their appreciation of science. The main weakness of the proposal is the lack of a clear explanation of how the globe will be used in the classroom. A few detailed examples would have considerably enhanced the proposal. The PI is a botanist but does not mention other faculty members who would use the globe, and how. The panel recommends full funding if additional funds become available.
Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Equipment/Non Equipment</th>
<th>New/Continuation</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Sandra Guzman</td>
<td>Baton Rouge Community College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>BRCC: A Sustainable Commuter College</td>
<td>$38,174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002EAR-16</td>
<td>Mrs. Kayla Smith</td>
<td>Delgado Community College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>The creation and implementation of the Welcome Military and Transfer [MAT] Services</td>
<td>$69,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Kristine DeLong</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Inductively Coupled Plasma Optical Emission Spectrometer for Research in Geography and Anthropology</td>
<td>$116,227.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004EAR-16</td>
<td>Prof. Darrell Henry</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Acquisition of a Wavelength Dispersive Spectrometer for the JEOL 8230 Electron Microprobe at LSU: Implications for Research and Teaching of Solid [Geo] Materials</td>
<td>$58,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Achim Herrmann</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Acquisition of sample preparation equipment to enhance research and teaching capabilities in environmental biogeochemistry at Louisiana State University</td>
<td>$191,955.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Kory Konsoer</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Acquisition of a shallow water sonar system to enhance riverine and coastal research and education</td>
<td>$134,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007EAR-16</td>
<td>Prof. Chunyan Li</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Development of Automated Surface Craft to Enhance Real-time Coastal Environmental Observations</td>
<td>$91,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Kanchan Maiti</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>MECHANISTIC UNDERSTANDING OF OCEAN ACIDIFICATION AND CARBON FLUXES IN MARINE AND COASTAL SYSTEMS - A TOOL FOR RESEARCH AND EDUCATION</td>
<td>$79,736.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Kevin Robbins</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>LSU ScienceNET - A Network and Computational Enhancement For Data-driven Science and Analytics</td>
<td>$329,177.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010EAR-16</td>
<td>Prof. Sophie Warny</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Adding Forensic Capabilities to the Center for Excellence in Palynology</td>
<td>$106,490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Kehui Xu</td>
<td>Louisiana State University and A &amp; M College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Acquisition of Acoustic and Optical Sensors to Enhance the Research and Teaching of Sediment Diversion and Coastal Restoration</td>
<td>$89,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Amy Erickson</td>
<td>Louisiana State University in Shreveport</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Providing Louisiana State University in Shreveport students with field-rich training in marine conservation</td>
<td>$34,176.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Natalie Clay</td>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Stereomicroscopes for environmental science courses</td>
<td>$75,029.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Brian Roberts</td>
<td>Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Enhancement of capabilities to analyze environmental changes in Louisiana's coastal ecosystems</td>
<td>$174,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Christopher Bonvillain</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Water quality sampling equipment to enhance environmental biology research and teaching at Nicholls State University</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Number</td>
<td>PI Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Equipment/ Non Equipment</td>
<td>New/ Continuation</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Amount Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016EAR-16</td>
<td>Prof. Raj Boopathy</td>
<td>Nicholls State University</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Enhancement of Environmental Science Education at Nicholls State University</td>
<td>$105,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017EAR-16</td>
<td>Mr. Stephen Waddell</td>
<td>Nunez Community College</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Learning to Fish</td>
<td>$80,351.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,351.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Todd Murphy</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Integrating research and education through continuous atmospheric temperature and moisture profiles</td>
<td>$153,969.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$153,969.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019EAR-16</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas Sasek</td>
<td>University of Louisiana at Monroe</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>New Request</td>
<td>Earth and Environmental Science on a Sphere</td>
<td>$65,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,650.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Proposals submitted: 19
Total Money Requested for First Year: $2,074,534.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year: $0.00
Total Money Requested: $2,074,534.00
Appendix B

Rating Forms
INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

YES_____NO_____ A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?

_____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—56 points

_____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?

_____ of 21 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 and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?

_____ of 5 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/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/or quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)?

_____ of 5 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 pedagogy?

_____ of 5 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. EQUIPMENT—10 points

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

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

_____ 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?
D. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

E. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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 college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?

_____ of 10 pts. E.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?

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?

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 $__________________

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 2015)
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2015-16

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.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION—10 points

YES_____NO_____ A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and department(s)/unit(s) that will benefit from the 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)/unit(s) and/or curricula?
_____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s)/unit(s)?

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN—66 points

_____ of 10 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Are they realistic? Are the objectives measurable? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
_____ 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 and a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished?
_____ of 8 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project propel the department(s)/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 8 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)?
_____ of 8 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 8 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogy?
_____ of 4 pts. B.7 To what extent does the proposal indicate how the PIs will assess/evaluate the degree to which the project has achieved its goals?

C. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE—12 points

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

D. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT—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, or another college or university or consortium of colleges and universities, federal government agency)?
_____ of 10 pts. D.2 To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing economic, cultural and/or academic development and/or resources in Louisiana?
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?

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 $____________________

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 2015)