

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS

REVIEW OF MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

FY 2003-04

MARCH 2004

Prepared by:

Dr. E. C. Ashby
Organic Chemistry Division
School of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Georgia Institute of Technology (Emeritus)
Chairman

Dr. David W. Tedder
School of Chemical Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology

FY 2003–2004 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. Daniel Tedder, Department of Chemical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, met at the Georgia Institute of Technology on January 9, 2004, and again on February 2, 2004, to evaluate twelve (12) Multidisciplinary Enhancement proposals submitted for funding consideration in FY 2003–04. A budget of \$250,000 is available for first-year awards.

The Chairman received the following materials prior to the meeting: (a) the twelve 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 chemical engineering, corrosion, and advanced computer technology from Dr. Daniel Tedder of the School of Chemical Engineering at the Georgia Institute of Technology. The independent reviews of proposals 002MUL-04 and 004MUL-04 by the Chairman were in complete agreement with the reviews provided by Dr. Tedder. The ten remaining proposals were straightforward and no other experts were sought. During the reviews, each proposal was reviewed 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 12 proposals. Table I contains a rank–order list of the 9 proposals that are highly recommended for funding, with the recommended funding levels. Table II contains a list of 3 proposals recommended for funding if additional funds become available, with the recommended funding levels. 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 a funding recommendation corresponding to the most pressing needs presented.

In summary, irrespective of rank, proposals 001MUL-04, 002MUL-04, 003MUL-04, 004MUL-04, 005MUL-04, 006MUL-04, 008MUL-04, 010MUL-04, and 012MUL-04 are recommended for partial funding (see Table I), and proposals 007MUL-04, 009MUL-04 and 011MUL-04 are recommended for funding if additional funds become available.

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	003MUL-04	LSU-S	\$59,350	\$30,000	\$45,370	\$25,000
2	83	008MUL-04	NICHOLLS	\$51,511	\$39,990		
3	82	004MUL-04	LA TECH	\$39,883	\$25,000		
4	79	002MUL-04	DILLARD	\$72,512	\$56,559		
5	77	006MUL-04	LA TECH	\$43,764	\$20,862		
5	77	012MUL-04	UNO, DILLARD, TULANE, XAVIER	\$205,440	\$27,589		
7	73	010MUL-04	SUBR	\$40,987	\$15,000		
8	72	005MUL-04	LA TECH	\$49,540	\$15,000		
8	72	001MUL-04	DILLARD	\$90,071	\$20,000		
TOTAL:				\$653,058	\$250,000	\$45,370	\$25,000

TABLE II

**PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING
IF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND-YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND-YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
10	71	011MUL-04	ULM	\$228,415	\$228,415	\$0	\$0
11	70	007MUL-04	LA TECH	\$79,274	\$50,479		
11	70	009MUL-04	SUBR	\$99,230	\$24,640		
TOTAL:				\$406,919	\$303,534	\$0	\$0

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001MUL-04

Institution: Dillard University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of the “Dillard Visual Religious Art Program”

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 12 (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 4 (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 7 (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: \$90,071
Recommended Amount: \$20,000

COMMENTS:

The purpose of this proposal is to further develop and enhance the Dillard University Visual Religious Art Program. It is proposed that a World Religions Exhibit/Forum be hosted by Dillard University. This effort necessitates the purchase of a large projection screen, operator console, digital production system, sound system, cameras, etc. In addition, funds will be used to support an art gallery exhibit in the spring semester of 2005 and also the production of a DVD, which will be made available to museums and art centers. It is proposed that such a program will result in better student/faculty interactions and better interactions with local artists.

Although the proposal is not well written and contains numerous grammatical and typographical errors and misspelled words, it does have merit. The PIs are to be congratulated for attempting to do what they believe will make an educational difference for their students. Because of a scarcity of funds, only partial support of \$20,000 can be recommended for this project, which may be expended at the PI's discretion. The institutional match of \$18,975 may be reduced proportionally.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002MUL-04

Institution: Dillard University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of Computational Chemical Engineering Instruction and Research”

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

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes _____ No X

H. Total Score 79 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$72,512
Recommended Amount: \$56,559

COMMENTS:

This is a strong proposal that will increase the computing capabilities for instruction and faculty research at Dillard. The applicants request funds for purchase of 20 Dell Dimension 2400 PCs, which is modest, but partial funding for at least 10 PCs would still be helpful. The applicants make a strong case for the variety of ways in which the requested equipment would be used to enhance the education of about 500 engineering students through their enrollment in about 30 courses. It is essential that universities have modern computing capabilities in order to adequately train students for industrial positions and to perform research. Although it is not possible to fully fund this proposal, the Panel recommends that it be funded at the \$56,559 level. Funds may be allocated at the discretion of the PIs, although travel to conferences and workshops must adhere to State Travel Policies and Procedures (PPM 49). The University pledges \$28,012 in institutional match, but fails to mention whether this support is in-cash or in-kind. The University match of \$28,012 may be reduced proportionally.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003MUL-04

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

Title of Proposal: “Multidisciplinary Computational Analysis Enhancement”

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 1 (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 10 (of 12 points)

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

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a 8 (For S/E)
or (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 86 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested
Amount: Yr. 1 \$59,350 Yr. 2 \$45,370
Recommended
Amount: Yr. 1 \$30,000 Yr. 2 \$25,000

COMMENTS:

This is an excellent proposal by a group of eleven faculty members from LSU-Shreveport. The proposal is directed toward establishment of an advanced computational analysis core facility in the College of Sciences affecting several departments (e.g., engineering, health and medical sciences, environmental sciences, etc.) and will affect 500 undergraduate students per semester. This laboratory will help LSU-S keep pace with progress in computer-based system simulation and modeling, high performance data processing, etc. In order to establish such a facility, it will be necessary to purchase a 16-node Linux cluster-type system; a total of 64 nodes are envisioned for the future. The establishment of such a laboratory should result in substantial educational gains as well as industrial outreach directly related to economic development in the area. This proposal has strong financial support from the institution, private/Federal sources, and departmental funds. Fully supporting this project is not possible due to limited funds; however, the Panel recommends funding of \$30,000 in year 1 and \$25,000 in year 2, with the addition of some matching funds so that at least the 16-node system may be purchased. Institutional (\$193,589) and other (\$61,000) sources of match may be reduced proportionally to the recommended budget.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004MUL-04

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancement of Materials Durability Education”

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> 17 </u>	(of 20 points)
B.3	<u> 4 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.4	<u> 1 </u>	(of 2 points)
B.5	<u> 3 </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> 2 </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> 4 </u>	(of 4 points)
-----	------------------	---------------

G. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u> \$39,883 </u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$25,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

The applicant proposes to enhance the faculty’s ability to provide students with hands-on experience in measuring corrosion resistance and other applications through acquisition of a potentiostat, an impedance analyzer, and software. Corrosion is a major problem for existing infrastructure (e.g., bridges) and doubtless it is a particular concern for Louisiana. Also, hands-on experience is very important for giving students a better intuitive feel for corrosion and its likely impacts. The applicant also points out that the same equipment can be used for various applications for aerospace, petrochemical wood products, and other industries that are important in Louisiana, so this proposal focuses on enhancing instruction and research in several important areas of economic development for the state. Funding of \$25,000 is recommended for this project, which may be expended at the PI’s discretion for budgeted equipment, software, and supplies. It is likely that some reduction in costs can be achieved through competitive bids. Because of limited funds it is not possible to fully fund this project. The applicant has pledged an institutional match of \$39,260, which may be reduced proportionally to the recommended budget.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005MUL-04

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “Enhancing Multidisciplinary Freshman Education Through a Wireless Computer Network”

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 3 (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 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 No X

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:	<u> \$49,540 </u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$15,000 </u>

COMMENTS:

This well-written proposal will improve freshman engineering courses at Louisiana Tech, specifically for the College of Engineering and Sciences. The proposal suggests that this can be done by purchasing 20 laptop computers, a wireless accent point, and a security cart. The goals are to help the students make connections between math, science, and engineering and to better prepare students for senior-level courses. There is no question that using laptop computers in the classroom would be very advantageous for faculty evaluation of students' computer skills, including the use of certain software packages. However, this proposal suffers by having only one faculty member involved, and the sole objective is to provide laptop computers for students. Since these are engineering and science students, it is suggested (as it is at many other universities) that students be required to have their own laptops that are necessary for these and other courses. It is not expected that every student have his/her own pH meter, atomic absorption spectrometer, etc.; however, today college students should be expected to have laptops. Nevertheless, since some students may not be able to afford their own laptop, partial support of \$15,000 is recommended. Lack of funds also makes it necessary for the applicant to more rigorously evaluate the needs described and seek lower prices on equipment (Dell laptops, with an educational discount, should run in the \$800-\$1,000 range). The institutional match of \$16,951 may be reduced proportionally to the recommended award.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006MUL-04

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “Soil and Environmental Science Teaching Laboratory Equipment Enhancement”

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 18 (of 20 points)
B.2 18 (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 0 (of 3 points)

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

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

E.1 2 (of 2 points)
E.2a _____ (For S/E)
or _____ (of 10 points)
E.2b 7 (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 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$43,764
Recommended Amount: \$20,862

COMMENTS:

This is an excellent proposal to update the existing Soil Science Teaching Laboratory (SSTL) in order to do a more effective job teaching basic soil sciences and concepts related to water quality. It is clear that the present laboratory is outdated and inadequate for the objectives of the program. Approximately 100 students a year are taught using the SSTL facilities. Unfortunately the \$20,862 recommended is insufficient to satisfy all of the requested needs, but this amount should meet all needs except for three pieces of equipment: (1) the Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (\$17,213), (2) the multifunction pH/mv/EC/DO meter (\$1,933), and (3) the Aquatic Biological Oxygen Demand system (\$3,756). It is suggested that the PIs request support for these items from three of their strong supporters: the Louisiana Tech Agricultural Advisory Council, the Environmental Sciences Advisory Committee, and the Forestry Advisory Committee. All of these businesses associated with Louisiana Tech who stand to profit from their programs should be willing to contribute to a project that is being supported through this award by both Louisiana Tech and the Board of Regents Support Fund. The institutional match of \$22,368 may be reduced proportionally to the recommended budget.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007MUL-04

Institution: Louisiana Tech University

Title of Proposal: “Multi-Departmental, Multi-Disciplinary Research Enhancements at Louisiana Tech University Needed to Achieve National Competitiveness in the Study of Sensory and Communication Impairments and Their Augmentation or Substitution”

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 16 (of 20 points)
B.2 14 (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 4 (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 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 70 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$79,274
Recommended Amount: \$50,479
(if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

This well-written and -documented proposal was submitted by (1) the Center for Biomedical Engineering and Rehabilitation Science, (2) the Center for the Professional Development of Instruction in Blindness, and (3) the Audiology and Speech Pathology department. Its objective is to carry out multidisciplinary research in the area of sensory and communication augmentation and substitution. Specific objectives are directed to individuals with multiple impairments or greatly impaired motor skills, and the promotion of research directed to brain-computer interface technology. Funds are requested to purchase numerous pieces of equipment (Braille computers, Erica System, 32 channel EEG recording and mapping system, etc. If additional funds become available, the Panel recommends an award of \$50,479, which may be expended at the discretion of the PIs. Institutional match of \$27,743 may be reduced proportionally to the recommended budget if the proposal does receive some Support Funds.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008MUL-04

Institution: Nicholls State University

Title of Proposal: "Fine Arts Technology Integration"

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 18 (of 20 points)
 B.2 15 (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 2 (of 2 points)
 E.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 E.2b 8 (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 83 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$51,511
 Recommended Amount: \$39,990

COMMENTS:

This proposal is well written, the two investigators are well qualified to carry out the proposed work, the objectives are important, and the acquisition of the proposed equipment (one computer, a mini DVD camcorder, speakers, two videoscree plasma displays, and related software and supplies, etc.) would positively affect not only faculty and students, but also many other local people. The proposed classroom facility will provide students, teachers, and the general public access to digital resources for education and research. Twenty-two faculty, 1,400 students, and thousands of individuals from the University and the regional area would benefit by this attempt to integrate technology into the Fine Arts curriculum. Students will develop computer skills using PowerPoint and the Blackboard course management system. The faculty will develop materials for lecture courses and public events within the goal of integrating digital images and recordings of historical art and music, in addition to art and music produced by students, faculty, and regional artists, in the curriculum. Reduced funding of \$39,990 is recommended for this worthy project and may be expended at the PIs' discretion; however, the institutional match of \$3,323 may be reduced proportionally to the recommended budget.

There are a number of problems with this proposal:

- (1) The cover page carries the name and signature of one faculty member although the credentials of eight others are listed. Should not everyone involved in the proposal have signed off on it?
- (2) The requested equipment appears to be a list of pieces of equipment lacking in currently existing programs.
- (3) In light of the sparse funding for twelve Multidisciplinary proposals [this proposal requests about one-third of the total funds allocated this year], it would seem more appropriate that the necessary funds would be best pursued from traditional sources in medicine (NIH), and occupational therapy (Louisiana Center for the Blind, VA Rehabilitation Center, etc.). Other proposals have only the possibility of receiving some Support Funds; this proposal has a better probability of receiving total funding through the agencies mentioned.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 009MUL-04

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

Title of Proposal: “Graduate Research on Energy and the Environment (GREEN)”

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 14 (of 20 points)
 B.3 4 (of 5 points)
 B.4 1 (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 9 (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 2 (of 4 points)

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes X No

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: \$99,230
 Recommended Amount: \$24,640
 (if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

This proposal requests funds for the purchase of a fuel cell test station, a potentiostat/galvanostat with accessories, fuel cell hardware, and equipment and supplies for in-house preparation of membrane electrode assemblies. The concept of project GREEN is a good one and at least one of the three PIs has demonstrated expertise in the area. The primary problem with this proposal is that the PIs spend too much time talking about their qualifications and the importance of project GREEN when they should have been discussing the importance of the specific equipment that they want to purchase. Another problem is that the specific equipment requested will serve only those interested in fuel cell research and will not serve a broader spectrum of the science faculty, like, for example, an NMR instrument or a computer would do. The equipment requested is essentially for one research project. Additionally, the PIs did not follow the guidelines for providing information for the biographical sketches. Further, there is no commitment of institutional funds for the project. Nevertheless, project GREEN is worthy of support, and the Panel recommends an award of \$24,640 if additional funds become available, which may be expended at the PIs' discretion. A rewriting of this proposal in a more acceptable fashion would have a better chance of obtaining some support. Additionally, the request is about 40% of the entire budget of \$250,000 allocated this year for twelve proposals.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010MUL-04

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

Title of Proposal: “A Mathematics & Science Research/Learning Laboratory for
Science/Mathematics Education”

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 16 (of 20 points)
B.2 17 (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 5 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 0 (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 8 (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 73 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$40,987
Recommended Amount: \$15,000

COMMENTS:

The Ph.D. program in Science/Mathematics Education (SMED) at Southern University is designed to produce scholars in mathematics and science education. SMED proposes equipping a multipurpose research/teaching laboratory with teaching and laboratory equipment needed for research in the design of computer learning programs and for design, piloting, and evaluation of laboratory activities. This proposal suffers in several ways: (1) there is only one PI, (2) the equipment list reads more like a “wish list” and is not realistic in terms of available funds, and (3) the applicant did not label section B.5 or receive any points for sections E.1 and F.1.

On the other hand, the proposal is adequate, expresses important needs (mathematics and science education for precollege to University students), and the needs have been thoughtfully assessed. It is recommended that the program begin with four or five computers and the remaining funds be expended at the PI’s discretion. Unfortunately, funds are limited and only partial support of \$15,000 is recommended. However, these funds should be awarded only on the condition that SUBR provide renovated space designated for the SMED laboratory (see section C.3).

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011MUL-04

Institution: University of Louisiana at Monroe

Title of Proposal: “Establishment of an Electron Microscopic Imaging and Chemical Analysis Facility at ULM”

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 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 7 (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 2 (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: Yr. 1 \$228,415 Yr. 2 \$0
 Requested Amount: Yr. 1 \$228,415 Yr. 2 \$0
 (if additional funds become available)

COMMENTS:

It is suggested that the need for scanning electron imaging and chemical analytical capabilities needed in a variety of research projects by a number of faculty be satisfied by the purchase of a Quanta 200 ESEM. Such a costly instrument (custom-configured Environmental Scanning Electron Microscope) will support research in nonstructural and compositional diagnostics in the areas of biomedical, pharmaceutical, and geosciences. The proposal is well written and the need for the instrumentation is substantiated for at least two of the participants. While certain project participants have strong track records, others do not. There are some gaps and inconsistencies in the CVs provided in the proposal. Furthermore, the PIs did not follow the RFP's guidelines; they squeezed about 50% more print per page than the RFP allows. The proposal's major problem is that the requested funds are nearly equal to the total allocation for the twelve Multidisciplinary proposals submitted this year, all of which were worthy of some support. Nevertheless, it is recommended that this proposal be fully funded if additional funds become available. If additional funds do become available for the recommended award of \$228,415, the institutional match of \$76,138 must be maintained. It is suggested that this proposal be submitted to other external funding agencies that have sufficient funds to support purchase of such expensive equipment.

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

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012MUL-04

Institution: University of New Orleans, Dillard University, Tulane University, Xavier University

Title of Proposal: “Virtual Reality Enhancement of New Orleans Area Universities”

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 17 (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 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 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 77 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$205,440
Recommended Amount: \$27,589

COMMENTS:

This is an interesting proposal to develop virtual environmental technology in order to solve problems in the areas of new composite materials, cellular and molecular action of hormones, immersive visualization of the Mississippi River estuary, and new ways to design and build ships, etc. Four universities are involved and the participating faculty are reasonably trained to pursue this joint endeavor. Virtual reality capability supporting such a large number of applications should provide enhanced opportunities for students and faculty, commercial businesses, and the State of Louisiana in general.

The one weakness of the proposal--other than that it requests 82% of the total funds available in this program--is that, other than Dr. Butler, the co-PIs and associated faculty have weak publication records. It is important, especially in a new area of technology, that research results and new capabilities be published. Due to a lack of funds, only partial support of \$27,589 is recommended to purchase mirrors and screens for the SSVR™ system, with the addition of some matching funds. The institutional (\$105,504) and other (\$25,000) matching funds may be reduced proportionally to the funds being recommended for this project.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Multidisciplinary
for the FY 2003-2004 Review Cycle**

Discipline/ Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001MUL-04	Enhancement of the "Dillard Visual Religious Art Program"	Dillard University (Philosophy and Religion/Art) ;	Alain P. Durocher ; Cheryl McKay Dixon ; Gail E. Bowman ;	1	\$90071
E	Proposal is a New Request				\$90071
Discipline(s): Arts					
002MUL-04	Enhancement of Computational Chemical Engineering Instruction and Research	Dillard University (Natural Science and Public Health) ;	Zujia Xu ; Azubike D. Okpalaeze ; Gloria C-Love ; Hong Dai ; Janice Burrell-Pinera ; Sayed Ahmed ;	1	\$72512
E	Proposal is a New Request				\$72512
Discipline(s): Engineering A					

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

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
E	Multidisciplinary Computational Analysis Enhancement	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Computer Science and Engineering Program) ;	Marjan Trutschl ; Brian Salvatore ; Cynthia J. Sisson ; Deborah K. Shepherd ; Gary R. Boucher ; Gary Hanson ; John A. Austin ; Malcolm L. McCallum ; Stephanie Aamodt ; Stephen W. Banks ; W. A. Vekovius ;	1	\$59350
				2	\$45370
				Total	\$104720

Proposal is a **New Request**

Discipline(s): Agricultural Sciences, Earth/Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, Health and Medical Sciences

E	Enhancement of Materials Durability Education	Louisiana Tech University (Mechanical Engineering) ;	Henry E. Cardenas ;	1	\$39883
				Total	\$39883

Proposal is a **New Request**

Discipline(s): Engineering A

E	Enhancing Multidisciplinary Freshman Education Through a Wireless Computer Network	Louisiana Tech University (Mechanical Engineering) ;	Kelly Crittenden ;	1	\$49540
				Total	\$49540

Proposal is a **New Request**

Discipline(s): Engineering A

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
006MUL-04	Soil and Environmental Science Teaching Laboratory Equipment Enhancement	Louisiana Tech University (Agricultural Sciences) ;	Jeff B. Hillard ; Milan C. Vavrek ; William B. Patterson ;	1	\$43764
E				Total	\$43764
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Agricultural Sciences, Earth/Environmental Sciences					
007MUL-04	Multi-Departmental, Multi-Disciplinary Research Enhancements at Louisiana Tech University Needed to Achieve National Competitiveness in the Study of Sensory and Communication Impairments and Their Augmentation or Substitution	Louisiana Tech University (Center for Biomedical Engineering and Rehabilitation Science) ;	Charles J. Robinson ;	1	\$79274
E				Total	\$79274
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Health and Medical Sciences					
008MUL-04	Fine Arts Technology Integration	Nicholls State University (Art) ;	Deborah H. Cibelli ; Gregory J. Torres ;	1	\$51511
E				Total	\$51511
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Arts					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009MUL-04	Graduate Research on Energy and the Environment (GREEN)	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Physics) ;	Diola Bagayoko ; Saleem Hasan ; Samuel Washington ;	1	\$99230
E				Total	\$99230
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Earth/Environmental Sciences, Engineering A					
010MUL-04	A Mathematics & Science Research/Learning Laboratory for Science/Mathematics Education	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Science/Mathematics Education) ;	Lynn B. Loftin ;	1	\$40987
E				Total	\$40987
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Earth/Environmental Sciences					
011MUL-04	Establishment of an Electron Microscopic Imaging and Chemical Analysis Facility at ULM	University of Louisiana at Monroe (Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences) ;	Karen P. Briski ; Melgardt M. DeVilliers ;	1 2	\$228415 \$0
E				Total	\$228415
Proposal is a New Request					
Discipline(s): Earth/Environmental Sciences, Health and Medical Sciences					

Discipline/ Proposal	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012MUL-04	Virtual Reality Enhancement for New Orleans Area Universities	University of New Orleans (NAME & Engineering Management) ; Dillard University; Tulane University; Xavier University;	Alley C. Butler ; Bradley Bell ; Bruce Brailsford ; Douglas Meffert ; Keith Wismar ; Kurt Satter ; Thomas Wiese ;	1	\$205440
E				Total	\$205440

Proposal is a **New Request**

Discipline(s): Earth/Environmental Sciences, Engineering A, Health and Medical Sciences

APPENDIX B

Proposal Evaluation Forms

Form 1 : For Purchase of Instructional and Research Equipment

Form 2 : For Other Than Equipment Purchases.

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2003-04**

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

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION – Total of 10 points

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

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN – Total of 52 points

- _____ of 20 points B.1. Are the objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 20 points 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 points 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 points 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 points 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 disciplines(s) of the proposed project?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND
 ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2003-04

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
 REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)

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

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

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

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

- | | | |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 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:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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

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

COMMENTS:

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

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

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

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____ Principal Investigator: _____

G. TOTAL SCORE (NOTE: Proposals with a total score below 70 will not be recommended for funding.)
_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

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

COMMENTS:

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

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____