

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

Introduction

A review panel consisting of Dr. E. C. Ashby (Chairman), School of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Georgia Institute of Technology and Dr. Eva Lee, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering (ISYE), Georgia Institute of Technology, met at the Georgia Institute of Technology on February 14, and again on February 17, 2003, to evaluate seven multidisciplinary Enhancement proposals submitted for funding consideration in FY 2002–03. A budget of \$200,000 is available for first-year awards.

The chairman of the committee received the following materials prior to the meeting: (a) the seven proposals and their appropriate rating forms; (b) a summary of proposals submitted listing titles, principal investigators, their institutions, and so forth; and (c) the appropriate Request for Proposals (RFP) containing criteria for the evaluation. The chairman solicited further expertise in the areas of technology transfer, supply network management, product usability, and usability engineering from Dr. Eva Lee of the Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering. The independent reviews of proposals 002MUL-03 and 006MUL-03 by the chairman were in complete agreement with the reviews provided by Dr. Lee. The five remaining proposals were straightforward and no other experts were sought. During the review meetings, each proposal was considered individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to the criteria in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review.

This report contains two tables that rank all proposals. Table I contains a rank-order list of proposals highly recommended for funding, with the recommended funding levels. There were no proposals recommended for funding if additional funds became available. The sole proposal not recommended for funding is 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 forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For all of the proposals listed in Table I, only partial funding was recommended because of the limitation of funds. The amount of partial funding was determined by a review of the budget resulting in funding corresponding to the most pressing needs presented.

In summary, proposals 001MUL-03, 002MUL-03, 003MUL-03, 004MUL-03, 005MUL-03, and 006MUL-03 are recommended for partial funding and proposal 007MUL-03 is not recommended for funding.

TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	86	001MUL-03	CEN	\$79,137	\$42,000	\$0	\$0
2	85	003MUL-03	LA TECH	\$16,460	\$13,360	\$0	\$0
3	83	002MUL-03	LSU-BR	\$73,396	\$44,000	\$0	\$0
4	80	006MUL-03	ULL & SUBR	\$109,835	\$40,640	\$46,761	\$25,000
5	72	004MUL-03	SUBR	\$67,766	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
6	71	005MUL-03	SUNO	\$60,079	\$30,000	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$406,673	\$200,000	\$46,761	\$25,000

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
7	66	007MUL-03	ULM	\$292,552	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTALS:				\$292,552	\$0	\$0	\$0

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-03

Institution: Centenary College

Title of Proposal: “A Modeling and Computer-Aided Design (CAD) Lab for Computer Science, Engineering, and Information Technology”

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 52 Points)

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

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a 9 (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 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$79,137
Recommended Amount: \$42,000

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 for the improvement of an existing computer laboratory through the purchase of new computer hardware and software. If this proposal is supported, it is suggested that a “state-of-the-art” computerized presentation – modeling – computer-aided design capability be developed which would improve teaching and learning in computer sciences, engineering, and computer information technology. Such a laboratory will also make it possible for students and faculty to design graphical and computational models, as well as support the present engineering drawing course and assist student ability to design and test computer circuits. This proposal was very well written and the faculty involved are to be commended for their past performances and their enthusiastic desire to develop a first-class computational capability at a small college. This program should not only improve several endeavors at Centenary, but also provide well-trained students for Louisiana. Normally full support would have been recommended, however, due to the shortage of funds, only partial support is recommended. However, the pledged institutional match (\$9,560) and private sector match (up to \$10,000) should be maintained for the project.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-03

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

Title of Proposal: “Usability Center for Technology Innovative Industries in Louisiana”

A. The Current Situation
(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 52 Points)

B.1	<u> 18 </u>	(of 20 points)
B.2	<u> 18 </u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u> 5 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u> 1 </u>	(of 2 points)
B.5	<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)

C. Equipment
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

D.1	<u> 10 </u>	(of 12 points)
-----	---------------	----------------

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

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

F. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

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

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u> \$73,396 </u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$44,000 </u>

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

This proposal involves the establishment of a usability center for the technology industry in Louisiana. The idea is interesting and the support from industrial partners will be crucial for its success. The suggestion that the goal of such a center would rival those at Microsoft and Apple might be unrealistic. However, such a center would certainly provide a service to local technology companies and promote collaboration between the university and industrial practitioners. The faculty appears to be more than capable to carry out the project. Unfortunately, only partial support of \$44,000 is recommended due to limited funds. The pledged institutional match of \$65,765 should be maintained for the project.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-03

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “The Media and the Middle East”

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 62 Points)

B.1 23 (of 25 points)
B.2 20 (of 25 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (of 2 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)

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

C.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

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

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 2 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes No X

G. Total Score 85 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$16,460
Recommended Amount: \$13,360

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 modest funds to support a pilot program entitled The Media and the Middle East for a new “Core Inquiries Project” in the College of Liberal Arts at Louisiana Tech University. This program is designed to increase interdisciplinary exchange over a several-year period, among the various liberal arts departments on key world issues. Courses in the Departments of History, Political Science, and Journalism will be organized to support the core topic. The proposal is well written and the objectives clear. The PIs are well established and have suggested inviting an outstanding group of people as guest speakers.

The one reservation about this program is that the subject of the program is controversial and emotional. The PIs must make a strong effort to balance the speakers so that both sides of the issues can be presented. The idea to take honor students and faculty to the Student Arab League Conference in Commerce, Texas, seems inappropriate, as does the \$600 expenditure for an external evaluation of the conference. Thus, these funds totaling \$3,100 have been eliminated from recommended funds of \$13,360. Due to limited funds, only partial support is recommended. However, the pledged institutional match (\$7,830) should be maintained.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-03

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

Title of Proposal: “Creating a Science/Mathematics Education Student Research Learning Center”

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 52 Points)

B.1 18 (of 20 points)
B.2 16 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (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 2 (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 0 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 0 (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 72 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$67,766
Recommended Amount: \$30,000

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 Ph.D. program in Science/Mathematics Education (SMED) at Southern University in Baton Rouge is requesting funds to provide desks, computers, corrals, bookcases, file cabinets, projectors, cameras, printer-scanner-copiers, etc., for a room designated as a learning center for its students. At present, the students of SMED have no place to congregate, study, interact, read journals, etc. Such a place is sorely needed and overdue. Unfortunately, since the RFP specifically disallows standard office equipment, all furnishings must be deleted.

There are a number of other problems with this proposal: (1) pages of the proposal are incorrectly assembled; (2) the abstract is not a proper abstract; (3) the discussion in section B.2 does not answer the questions that were asked; (4) the equipment budget is not reasonable based on funds available; (5) page 6, items on third and fourth lines list incorrect totals; (6) items in the equipment budget are overpriced (chairs listed at \$200 each can be purchased at Office Depot for \$50 each); and (7) what hurts the proposal further is that the questions presented in sections E.1, E.2, and F were not answered; therefore, no points could be given.

Nevertheless, the proposal was adequate and expressed critical needs, and if fulfilled, would contribute greatly to the SMED program, the students, the faculty, Southern University, and the State. The recommended funds (\$30,000) can provide for most of the essential equipment and software requested.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-03

Institution: Southern University and A&M College - New Orleans

Title of Proposal: “Technological Enhancement of the Psychology and Print Journalism Laboratories”

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 13 (of 20 points)
B.3 5 (of 5 points)
B.4 2 (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 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 6 (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 71 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$60,079
Recommended Amount: \$30,000

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

This proposal is submitted by the departments of Psychology and Print Journalism for the purpose of obtaining needed equipment. The request is predominantly for computers (18), printers (3), TV/VCR/DVD (1), overhead projector (1), CD burner/copier (2), videotapes (10), and numerous accessories. The applicants' current equipment is outdated and inadequate. The requested equipment is sorely needed in order to provide a satisfactory educational experience for the students studying Psychology and Print Journalism. The PIs have a strong background in their respective areas and are deserving of support. Unfortunately, due to limited funds, only partial support of \$30,000 can be recommended. All furniture is disallowed (tables, chairs, and cabinet). They may use discretion in the selection of equipment, software, and accessories.

**RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS
OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES**

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Lafayette
Southern University and A&M College - Baton Rouge

Title of Proposal: “Establishment of the Louisiana Supply Network Education Testbed (LouiSNET)”

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 62 Points)

B.1 21 (of 25 points)
B.2 21 (of 25 points)
B.3 4 (of 5 points)
B.4 1 (of 2 points)
B.5 4 (of 5 points)

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

C.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

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

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 3 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes X No

G. Total Score

80

 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested			
	Amount:	Yr. 1	<u> \$109,835 </u>	Yr. 2 <u> \$46,761 </u>
	Recommended			
	Amount:	Yr. 1	<u> \$40,640 </u>	Yr. 2 <u> \$25,000 </u>

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

This proposal involves the establishment of the “Louisiana Supply Network Education Testbed” within the University of Louisiana Lafayette and Southern University at Baton Rouge. The proposal involves a multidisciplinary effort (Operations Research, Computer Science, Economics, Law) which integrates research, training, and industrial partnership. The mission of the proposal is clear and well thought out. The funding request, however, is excessive given limited Support Funds. However, the applicants have done a good job in the past with funds received from several sources, and there is no reason to believe that they will not achieve most of their objectives. The results of (LouiSNET) should be a valuable asset to the State of Louisiana. Partial funding in Year 1 is recommended at \$40,640, and for Year 2, \$25,000. The PIs have discretion in which line items funds should be reduced. However, the pledged institutional match of \$8,295 for equipment and \$15,000 for graduate assistants should be maintained in full. The amount of \$60,521 pledged for faculty salaries may be reduced by half with a corresponding reduction in fringe and indirect costs. The pledged match for the seminars may be reduced to \$2,000.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-03

Institution: University of Louisiana at Monroe

Title of Proposal: “Creating Multimedia Learning Environments in the ULM College of Arts and Sciences”

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No
A.2 5 (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 12 (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 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 1 (of 3 points)

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1 1 (of 2 points)
E.2a (For S/E)
or (of 10 points)
E.2b 5 (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 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$292,552
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 equip eight classrooms in eight different buildings with state-of-the art electronic equipment to improve students' presentation methods. The dual objectives--1) to integrate the most modern technology in the classroom to expose students to more modern methods of teaching, and 2) to encourage inter- and multidisciplinary instruction among the faculty--are indeed worthy, if ambitious.

The proposal presents a number of troubling aspects, starting with the abstract: the single most important page of a proposal. It was poorly written and difficult to follow. Section F of the proposal was missing, and two paragraphs on page 13 were repeated on page 14. Judicious editing would have caught these errors. More importantly, the equipment appears to be more of a wish list than a reasonable request for limited funds. However, it is noted that this request is matched by a pledge of \$165,518 from the University, primarily for "room use" and "personnel training". No funding is recommended at this time.

There is no question that the goals of this proposal are admirable and worth pursuing; however, a proposal that requests more money than is allocated for the entire Multidisciplinary component of the Enhancement Program stands little chance for success when funds are severely limited. It is suggested that the abstract be rewritten, the equipment request be reduced to a reasonable size, and the proposal be resubmitted at the next proposal submission cycle.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary
for the FY 2002-2003 Review Cycle**

Discipline/ Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MUL-03 E	A Modeling and Computer-Aided Design (CAD) Lab for Computer Science, Engineering, and Information Technology	Centenary College (Computer Science, Engineering, and Information Technology Studies) ;	Alfred L. McKinney ; David E. Thomas ; Derrick Head ; Juan Rodriguez ; Katherine Brandl ; Mark Schlatter ;	1 Total	<u>\$79137</u> \$79137
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Computer/Information Sciences, Engineering B					
002MUL-03 E	Usability Center for Technology Innovative Industries in Louisiana	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Industrial & Manufacturing Engineering) ;	Craig M. Harvey ; Andrea L. Houston ; Donald H. Kraft ; Fereydoun Aghazadeh ;	1 Total	<u>\$73396</u> \$73396
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Engineering B					

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

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003MUL-03	The Media and the Middle East	Louisiana Tech University (History) ;	Brian C. Etheridge ; Jo Allen Richardson ; Kenneth Robbins ; Reginald Owens ;	1	\$16460
N				Total	\$16460
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Humanities					
004MUL-03	Creating a Science/Mathematics Education Student Research Learning Center	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Science/Mathematics Education) ;	Lynn B. Loftin ; Exyie C. Ryder ;	1	\$67766
E				Total	\$67766
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Biological Sciences, Computer/Information Sciences					
005MUL-03	Technological Enhancement of the Psychology and Print Journalism Laboratories	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Psychology) ;	Thomas J. Hebert ; Norbert Davidson ; Terrance L. Lewis ;	1	\$60079
E				Total	\$60079
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Social Sciences					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MUL-03 N	Establishment of the Louisiana Supply Network Education Testbed (LouiSNET)	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Mechanical Engineering) ; Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Mechanical Engineering);	Ramesh Kolluru ; Ann Keaty ;	1	\$109835
			Ghanashyam A. Joshi ; Mark Smith ; Melissa Waters ; Paul H.	2	\$46761
			Meredith ; Rand W. Ressler ;	Total	\$156596
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Computer/Information Sciences, Engineering B, Social Sciences, Humanities					
007MUL-03 E	Creating Multimedia Learning Environments in the ULM College of Arts & Sciences	University of Louisiana at Monroe (History & Government) ;	Gordon E. Harvey ; Jeffrey M. Gibson ; Thomas W. Sasek ;	1	\$292552
				Total	\$292552
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Humanities					

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: _____