

2002-03 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCES

INTRODUCTION

A Computer and Information Sciences review panel consisting of Rubin Professor John T. Gorgone, Bentley College (Department of Computer Information Systems); Professor John Trimble, Howard University (Department of Systems and Computer Science); and Professor Michael A. Harrison, Chairman, University of California Berkeley (Computer Science Division-EECS) met during February 17-18, 2003, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana for the purpose of evaluating twenty (20) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement component of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund program. A major snow storm prevented Professor Trimble from attending the meeting in Baton Rouge. However, Professor Trimble was able to participate via phone and Internet connections.

The review panel received the following material prior to the visit: a) twenty (20) Computer and Information Sciences proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2002-03 Enhancement Request for Proposals; and d) a copy of a previous (2000) report in Computer and Information Sciences.

Prior to the February meeting, each panel member read the material, assessed the proposals and tentatively completed the rating form for each proposal. At its meeting in Baton Rouge, the panel then discussed each proposal and transformed the individual tentative ratings into a composite panel rating. The panel then prepared comprehensive ratings and drafted its final report.

Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. 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 form used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

Each proposal was reviewed and discussed in detail by the review panel. The panel felt that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on the criteria enumerated. Only a few of the proposals in Table I were recommended for funding at the level of their requests. In most cases, only partial funding was possible because of the limitation of funds. However, the partial funding was determined by a review of the budget resulting in funded amounts corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. Other proposals were deemed inappropriate for this competition, and resubmission to more appropriate programs was suggested.

TABLE I

PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	78	011C/IS-03	NSU	\$60,381	\$60,381
2	77	016C/IS-03	ULL	\$187,016	\$65,000
3	76	006C/IS-03	LSU-S	\$95,800	\$60,000
4	75	009C/IS-03	LOYOLA	\$59,583	\$59,583
5	74	002C/IS-03	DILLARD	\$99,172	\$65,000
6	73	018C/IS-03	UNO	\$152,591	\$65,668
7	72	020C/IS-03	UNO	\$153,411	\$56,000
8	71	013C/IS-03	ULL	\$54,992	\$50,000
9	70	008C/IS-03	LA TECH	\$68,860	\$50,000
TOTALS:				\$931,806	\$531,632

TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
10	67	019C/IS-03	UNO	\$161,319	\$0
11	65	005C/IS-03	LSU-BR	\$93,625	\$0
11	65	012C/IS-03	TUHSC	\$239,568	\$0
13	62	017C/IS-03	ULM	\$212,000	\$0
13	62	003C/IS-03	LSU-BR	\$68,653	\$0
15	60	014C/IS-03	ULL	\$134,500	\$0
16	59	001C/IS-03	DILLARD	\$122,444	\$0
17	56	007C/IS-03	LSU-S	\$101,747	\$0
17	56	015C/IS-03	ULL	\$163,400	\$0
19	55	004C/IS-03	LSU-BR	\$159,660	\$0
20	45	010C/IS-03	McNEESE	\$118,578	\$0
TOTALS:				\$1,575,494	\$0

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001C/IS-03

Institution: Dillard University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of Computer Science Instruction (Phase II)”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 12 (of 20 points)
B.2 12 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 1 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 59 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$122,444
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel does not recommend funding for the proposal because the enhancement plan is inadequate and the rationale is not clear. The proposal is too broad, did not make a case for need, and failed to provide convincing evidence to an informed reader that the equipment currently available to the department is obsolete.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002C/IS-03

Institution: Dillard University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of Computer Science Instruction and Research CSIR-1”

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 52 Points)

B.1 15 (of 20 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$99,172
Recommended Amount: \$65,000

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

The panel recommends funding the proposal at \$65,000. The goals of the project can be met with a reduced budget by purchasing less costly servers and PCs. The panel recommends reducing the number of laptops in this laboratory configuration and taking advantage of educational discounts and state contract pricing. The institutional match should be maintained at the indicated level.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003C/IS-03

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

Title of Proposal: “A 64-Bit Symmetric Multiprocessor”

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 52 Points)

B.1 10 (of 20 points)
B.2 10 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (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 9 (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)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$68,653
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel suggests that this proposal more clearly falls within the Engineering discipline. The panel does not recommend funding because of an inadequate enhancement plan. Also, it appears that this effort will have less impact on the computer science and information science curricula, faculty and students than stronger proposals with fully developed enhancement plans. Based on current resources available, the need for the program was not convincing.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004C/IS-03

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

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of the Communication and Signal Processing Lab”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 1 (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 7 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 55 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$159,660
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The proposal is a request to enhance the hardware capability in the Electrical & Computer Engineering Department’s lab and is primarily intended to improve graduate education. Of the eight courses served by the lab, three are aimed at undergraduates. It is unclear why laptops are needed. This signal processing effort seems more appropriate for Electrical Engineering than Computer/Information Sciences. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal because of an inadequate enhancement plan; further, the proposal did not include the required section pertaining to the economic and/or cultural development and impact.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005C/IS-03

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

Title of Proposal: “Enhancing Internet Teaching Laboratory for Security and Advanced Networking”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 16 (of 20 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$93,625
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The panel suggests that this proposal more clearly falls within the Engineering discipline. Since this proposal requests funding for routers, T3 and T1 lines, **some panelists felt that this broad-use type of equipment should be purchased by the University, not with Support Fund monies.** The panel does not recommend funding this proposal at this time because of the severe limitation of Support Funds.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006C/IS-03

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

Title of Proposal: “Research and Application of High Bandwidth Synchronous/Asynchronous Instruction”

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 52 Points)

B.1 18 (of 20 points)
B.2 17 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 7 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 76 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$95,800
Recommended Amount: \$60,000

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

The proposal requests funds to create a laboratory to study asynchronous and synchronous learning. The panel recommends funding the proposal at \$60,000 with the understanding that the PI has full discretion in which categories reductions occur. The promised institutional match should be maintained for the project.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007C/IS-03

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

Title of Proposal: “CRAyfish Beowulf Cluster: North Louisiana's Supercomputer Facility”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 12 (of 20 points)
B.2 12 (of 20 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 1 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 56 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$101,747
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, as presented, will have a minimal impact on faculty development. There are excellent national supercomputer centers that provide free access to universities. This proposal has not indicated any experience in using these national resources or similar state facilities that are freely accessible. The proposal does not present a case why the facilities are insufficient. The case for an impact on curriculum and instruction would have been stronger if a history of the use of supercomputing at the University or by the faculty was indicated. The case for an impact on faculty was unconvincing since there was no indication how faculty would be trained in supercomputing applications. The proposal failed to demonstrate how non-CS application areas would be tied into the project to train faculty. In summary, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal at this time for the reasons stated and because the enhancement plan was not convincing.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008C/IS-03

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “Improving Computing Resources at Louisiana Tech University”

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 52 Points)

B.1 15 (of 20 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

H. Total Score 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$68,860
Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

The proposal has dual objectives: 1) improving the general-purpose lab by replacing 13 three-year-old computers with 20 new Pentium 4s (\$38,120) and 2) providing a prototype wireless classroom-lab with 16 portable computers (\$30,740). The panel recommends funding of \$50,000 with discretion provided to the PI regarding the selection of specific equipment items. However, the promised institutional match should be maintained for the project.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009C/IS-03

Institution: Loyola University New Orleans

Title of Proposal: “A Multi-Platform Laboratory for Teaching Distributed Computing and Internet Applications”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 17 (of 20 points)
B.2 16 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No X

H. Total Score 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$59,583
Recommended Amount: \$59,583

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 multi-purpose project covers networking, distributed computing, and Internet teaching and research. While the proposal mentions the involvement of the high schools, it is not clear how they will be involved. Nevertheless, the panel recommends funding the proposal at the requested amount (\$59,583).

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010C/IS-03

Institution: McNeese State University

Title of Proposal: “A Robotics/Control System Laboratory for McNeese State University”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 6 (of 20 points)
B.2 6 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 45 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$118,578
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The purpose of this proposal is to establish a robotics/control systems laboratory, basically, a Legos Mindstrom Lab. Because only minimal details were presented in the plan, it is unclear how this proposal will have a significant impact on curriculum development, research, or student and faculty development. The panel does not recommend funding for this proposal at this time.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011C/IS-03

Institution: Northwestern State University

Title of Proposal: “Data Communications: Enhancing the E-commerce Curriculum”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 78 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$60,381
Recommended Amount: \$60,381

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

The purpose of this proposal is to establish a small mobile data communications laboratory to enhance the e-curriculum. A number of faculty are involved and all have solid backgrounds. The University pledges \$20,000 in matching support. The panel recommends funding the proposal at the requested level (\$60,381).

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012C/IS-03

Institution: Tulane University Health Sciences Center

Title of Proposal: “Telesurgical Outreach Program (TOP)”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 15 (of 20 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (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 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

H. Total Score 65 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$239,568
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, with evidence of solid University backing, links laparoscopy to remote locations via the Internet. This is an interesting project in applied computing, however, it is not directly related to computer science or information technology. The panel suggests that this proposal more clearly falls within the Health and Medical Sciences disciplines, and the panel does not recommend funding at this time because of the limitation of Support Funds.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013C/IS-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Title of Proposal: “Laboratory for Real-Time Distributed Computing and Visualization”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

H. 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: \$54,992
Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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 create a laboratory for real-time distributed computing and visualization. The University pledges matching funds of \$11,848. While the panel recommends reduced funding of \$50,000, the promised institutional match should be maintained for the project. Although the equipment requested is fundamentally solid, the panel suggests that a less expensive workstation and PCs will serve the same purpose.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014C/IS-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Title of Proposal: “EECE Telecommunications IT Infrastructure Enhancement”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 8 (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)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 4 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 60 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$134,500
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 was designed to improve the quality of the telecommunications laboratory in the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department to support their BSEE and MS in Telecommunications. The focus on system prototyping of wireless and optical networking appears oriented more to Electrical Engineering or Computer Engineering than to information technology or Computer Science, therefore it would have less impact on faculty and students. The panel suggests that this proposal more clearly falls within the Engineering discipline, and the panel does not recommend funding this proposal at this time.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015C/IS-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Title of Proposal: “Device and Circuit Characterization in Multi-gigahertz Regime for
Wireless Communications”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 10 (of 20 points)
B.2 10 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 3 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 56 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$163,400
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The applicants' request for funds to create a facility to perform RF characterization of microstructures, devices, and circuits was unconvincing. Because this project seems to have a greater impact on Electrical Engineering than computing, the panel suggests that it more clearly falls within Engineering. The enhancement plan of this proposal does not present a strong enough case for how this project will directly impact computing research, education, students, and faculty. If this effort is to be undertaken as a Computer Science project, the enhancement plan must indicate how this effort will improve Computer Science courses and influence Computer Science research. The panel does not recommend funding this proposal at this time because of the limitation in Support Funds.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016C/IS-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

Title of Proposal: “Quality of Service Support in Mobile Wireless Networks”

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 52 Points)

B.1 19 (of 20 points)
B.2 18 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 1 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes No x

H. Total Score 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$187,016
Recommended Amount: \$65,000

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

The purpose of this proposal is to establish a Wireless and Mobile Networking Communication (WMNC) laboratory to support research on Quality of Service (QoS) in mobile wireless systems. A very detailed educational plan is presented with many references, and both WMNC and QoS are fully explained. The panel recommends funding the proposal at the reduced level of \$65,000 with discretion provided to the PIs regarding the selection and purchase of specific equipment items. The promised institutional match (\$20,000) should be maintained for the project. The panel recommends reducing the number of workstations and greatly reducing the number of laptops. Additional equipment reductions may also be necessary.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017C/IS-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Monroe

Title of Proposal: “CIS Technology Enhancement”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 14 (of 20 points)
B.2 16 (of 20 points)
B.3 2 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 2 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 0 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$212,000
Recommended Amount: \$0

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

The dual purposes of this proposal are to create a wireless classroom with 40 laptop computers (\$119,500) and to provide faculty training (\$92,500). The project involves a server-class machine and Internet networking. All of this expensive equipment is not needed to experience a wireless environment. This is an ambitious proposal in an important area. However, there is no indication that any preliminary work has been done along these lines. Some existing work in this area would indicate the University's commitment to this research domain and the investigators' ability to succeed in a project of this scope. Lacking this, we would suggest an initial, smaller scale, prototype effort be initiated before submitting a proposal of this scope. In summary, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal at this time of limited Support Funds for the reasons state above, because the enhancement plan is inadequate, and the equipment selection is less than appropriate.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018C/IS-03

Institution: University of New Orleans

Title of Proposal: “A Laboratory for Applied Computer Forensics Instruction and Research”

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 52 Points)

B.1 17 (of 20 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 3 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 9 (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 (of 10 points)
E.2b (For NS/NE)

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$152,591
Recommended Amount: \$65,668

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's goals are to create a computer forensics laboratory and a computer forensics program. The importance of PDA security in the overall computing curriculum is, however, questionable. Although the program is unique, it is also very ambitious; beginning on a smaller scale is strongly suggested. The panel recommends funding the proposal at the reduced level of \$65,668, with discretion provided to the PI regarding the specific items of equipment/software/supplies to be purchased. However, the pledged institutional match should be maintained for the project.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019C/IS-03

Institution: University of New Orleans

Title of Proposal: “Global Robotics: A Laboratory for Research and Instruction in Globally Accessible Robotics”

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 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (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 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 67 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$161,319
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.)

A stronger argument is needed to support the impact on existing resources. Three robotics/network labs currently exist to conduct research. The enhancement plan of this proposal does not present a strong case for how the project will directly impact computing research, education, students, and faculty. The proposal did not adequately define measurable objectives. Benchmarks were not provided. The goals expressed are very broad and lack specific measurable activities to ascertain success. For example, providing a list of potential NSF grant funding opportunities could have strengthened goal 5. A search of the NSF Website may have provided the necessary information. Insufficient metrics are provided to measure the success or failure of proposed courses. Although ABET accreditation is an important achievement, and is evidence of meeting minimum standards, it is not evidence of achieving eminence. Restating past achievements is an acceptable introduction, but what is needed to strengthen the proposal is a clear and thorough explanation of how this particular project will propel the department into attaining eminence. The economic benefit of this proposal needs to be stated as opposed to the departmental impact. Any future application(s) should provide more specific information. For these reasons, funding is not recommended.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL
AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020C/IS-03

Institution: University of New Orleans

Title of Proposal: “A Component-Based Software Integration Laboratory”

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 52 Points)

B.1 17 (of 20 points)
B.2 16 (of 20 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 3 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes x No

H. Total Score 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$153,411
Recommended Amount: \$56,000

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.)

Creation of a component-based software engineering laboratory is proposed. Component-based engineering is a popular and essential area of software engineering. The plan contains an appropriate activity schedule, although a poor selection of equipment detracts from the proposal. The panel recommends funding at \$56,000 for purchase of the software, switch, and printer. Additionally, the panel recommends purchase of less expensive equipment items, and fewer than 20 Dell 530 workstations. An alternative is to acquire other sources of funding to maintain the proposed configuration. The promised institutional match should be maintained for the project.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Computer & Information Sciences
for the FY 2002-2003 Review Cycle**

Discipline/ Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001C/IS-03	Enhancement of Computer Science Instruction (Phase II)	Dillard University (Computer Science) ;	Gloria C. Love ; Azubike D. Okpalaeze ; Janice Burrell-Pinera ; John E. Wilson ; Tommy S. Holton ;	1 .	\$122444
E	Proposal is a Continuation Request Previous Contract: LEQSF (2000-01)-ENH-UG-14			Total	\$122444
002C/IS-03	Enhancement of Computer Science Instruction and Research CSIR-1	Dillard University (Computer Science) ;	Azubike D. Okpalaeze ; Gloria C. Love ; Janice Burrell-Pinera ; Tommy S. Holton ;	1 .	\$99172
E	Proposal is a New Request			Total	\$99172

E=Primarily an Equipment Request
N=Not Primarily an Equipment Request

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003C/IS-03	A 64-Bit Symmetric Multiprocessor	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical & Computer Engineering) ;	David M. Koppelman ; J. Ramanujam ;	1	\$68653
E				Total	\$68653
Proposal is a New Request					
004C/IS-03	Enhancement of the Communication and Signal Processing Lab	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical and Computer Engineering) ;	Mort Naraghi-Pour ;	1	\$159660
E				Total	\$159660
Proposal is a New Request					
005C/IS-03	Enhancing Internet Teaching Laboratory for Security and Advanced Networking	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Electrical and Computer Engineering) ;	Suresh Rai ; Jerry L. Trahan ; Ramachandran Vaidyanathan ;	1	\$93625
E				Total	\$93625
Proposal is a New Request					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006C/IS-03	Research and Application of High Bandwidth Synchronous/Asynchronous Instruction	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Computer Science) ;	John Sigle ; Adrienne Critcher ; Jeff Key ;	1	\$95800
E				Total	\$95800
Proposal is a New Request					
007C/IS-03	CRAYfish Beowulf Cluster: North Louisiana's Supercomputer Facility	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Mathematics and Computer Science) ;	Marjan Trutschl ; John Sigle ; Krishna K. Agarwal ; Paul Sisson ;	1	\$101747
E				Total	\$101747
Proposal is a New Request					
008C/IS-03	Improving Computing Resources at Louisiana Tech University	Louisiana Tech University (Computer Science) ;	Albert E. Alexander ;	1	\$68860
E				Total	\$68860
Proposal is a New Request					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009C/IS-03	A Multi-Platform Laboratory For Teaching Distributed Computing and Internet Applications	Loyola University New Orleans (Mathematics & Computer Science) ;	Elias Khalaf ; Guillermo Tonsmann ;	1	\$59583
E				Total	\$59583
Proposal is a New Request					
010C/IS-03	A Robotics/Control System Laboratory for McNeese State University	McNeese State University (Mathematics, Computer Science, and Statistics) ;	William F. Denny ;	1	\$118578
E				Total	\$118578
Proposal is a New Request					
011C/IS-03	Data Communications: Enhancing the E-commerce Curriculum	Northwestern State University (Computer Information Systems) ;	Lissa F. Pollacia ; Jack Russell ; Michael Collins ; William Lomerson ;	1	\$60381
E				Total	\$60381
Proposal is a New Request					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012C/IS-03	Telesurgical Outreach Program (TOP)	Tulane University Health Sciences Center (Surgery SL-22) ;	Daniel J. Scott ; J. Bruce Dunne ; Robert L. Hewitt ;	1	\$239568
E				Total	\$239568
Proposal is a New Request					
013C/IS-03	Laboratory for Real-Time Distributed Computing and Visualization	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Advanced Computer Studies) ;	Charles D. Cavanaugh ;	1	\$54992
E				Total	\$54992
Proposal is a New Request					
014C/IS-03	EECE Telecommunications IT Infrastructure Enhancement	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical and Computer Engineering) ;	Robert R. Henry ; George Thomas ; Paul Darby ;	1	\$134500
E				Total	\$134500
Proposal is a New Request					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
015C/IS-03	Device and Circuit Characterization in Multi-gigahertz Regime for Wireless Communications	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Electrical & Computer Engineering) ;	Renuka P. Jindal ; Mohammad R. Madani ;	1	\$163400
E				Total	\$163400
Proposal is a New Request					
016C/IS-03	Quality of Service Support in Mobile Wireless Networks	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Center for Advanced Computer Studies) ;	Hongyi Wu ; Dmitri D. Perkins ;	1	\$187016
E				Total	\$187016
Proposal is a New Request					
017C/IS-03	CIS Technology Enhancement	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Computer Information Systems) ;	Ronald L. Berry ; John Rettenmayer ; Ruth Miller ;	1	\$212000
E				Total	\$212000
Proposal is a New Request					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
018C/IS-03	A Laboratory for Applied Computer Forensics Instruction and Research	University of New Orleans (Computer Science) ;	Golden G. Richard III ; Mahdi Abdelguerfi ;	1	\$152591
E				Total	\$152591
Proposal is a New Request					
019C/IS-03	Global Robotics: A Laboratory for Research and Instruction in Globally Accessible Robotics	University of New Orleans (Computer Science) ;	Golden G. Richard, III ; Sheila Tejada ;	1	\$161319
E				Total	\$161319
Proposal is a New Request					
020C/IS-03	A Component-Based Software Integration Laboratory	University of New Orleans (Computer Science) ;	Shengru Tu ; Mahdi Abdelguerfi ;	1	\$153411
E				Total	\$153411
Proposal is a New Request					

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS

Form 6.11

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals
Primarily Requesting Equipment

Form 6.12

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals
Primarily Requesting Non-Equipment Related Support
(e.g., Curricular Revisions, Colloquia)

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2002-03

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES _____ NO _____
- _____ of 5 pts. 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 project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

- _____ of 20 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.2 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.3 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.4 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.5 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?

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____ Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2002-03

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 _____
- _____ of 5 pts. A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- _____ of 25 pts. B.1 Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 25 pts. B.2 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.3 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.4 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.5 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?

COMMENTS:

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

Page 3 of 3

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: _____