

REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

January 19, 2009

Prepared by:

John Johannes (Chair)
Villanova University

John Pauly
Marquette University

Roy Knight
Florida A&M University

ENHANCEMENT REVIEW REPORT

SOCIAL SCIENCES

FY 2008-09

Introduction

The Social Sciences Review Panel consisting of Dr. John Johannes, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Villanova University; Dr. John Pauly, Provost, Marquette University; and Mr. Roy Knight, Professor of Architecture, Florida A&M University, met January 19, 2009 in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to evaluate twenty-one (21) proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents requesting funds through the Enhancement component of the Boards of Regents Support Fund.

The panel received the following materials prior to the visit: (1) all proposals and appropriate rating forms; (2) a summary of the proposals submitted listing titles, PIs, their institutions, and funds requested; (3) a copy of the most recent Social Sciences report (FY 2005-06); and (4) the FY 2008-09 Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Request for Proposals containing criteria for evaluation. After studying all proposals, the panel met in Baton Rouge to review and evaluate them. During the review each proposal was discussed individually and its merits were evaluated with respect to criteria detailed in the RFP. Each proposal received a thorough and impartial review. Subsequent to the individual evaluations, the panel ranked all proposals and recommended funding levels for those deemed worthy of funding.

The twenty-one (21) Social Sciences proposals submitted in FY 2008-09 requested a total of \$2,794,468 in first-year funds. Nine (9) proposals were highly recommended for funding, all at reduced levels.

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

**TABLE I
PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
1	83	010SS-09	LaTech	\$149,205	\$141,000		
2	81	008SS-09	LSUBR	\$118,343	\$118,000		
2	81	020SS-09	UNO	\$94,095	\$94,000	\$73,176	\$50,000
4	77	003SS-09	LSUA	\$362,120	\$81,000	\$15,410	\$0
4	77	014SS-09	NSU	\$155,506	\$155,300		
6	75	007SS-09	LSUBR	\$110,900	\$110,000		
7	74	012SS-09	LaTech	\$38,621	\$38,500		
7	74	018SS-09	ULM	\$28,031	\$25,200		
9	73	005SS-09	LSUBR	\$45,348	\$42,000		
TOTALS:				\$1,102,169	\$805,000	\$88,586	\$50,000

**TABLE II
PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED IF FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
10	72	016SS-09	ULL	\$524,463	\$417,000		
10	72	021SS-09	UNO	\$286,433	\$286,433		
12	71	006SS-09	LSUBR	\$103,255	\$103,255		
12	71	017SS-09	ULL	\$102,603	\$95,000		
TOTALS:				\$1,016,754	\$901,688	\$0	\$0

**TABLE III
PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

Rank	Rating	Proposal Number	Institution	First Year Funds Requested	First Year Funds Recommended	Second Year Funds Requested	Second Year Funds Recommended
14	68	004SS-09	LSUBR	\$23,950	\$0	\$43,740	\$0
15	66	009SS-09	LSUBR	\$195,993	\$0		
15	66	013SS-09	LaTech	\$22,465	\$0		
17	62	001SS-09	BPCC	\$140,763	\$0		
17	62	015SS-09	SUNO	\$58,500	\$0	\$44,450	\$0
19	60	019SS-09	UNO	\$24,529	\$0		
20	59	011SS-09	LaTech	\$122,727	\$0		
21	46	002SS-09	Dillard	\$86,618	\$0		
TOTALS:				\$675,545	\$0	\$88,190	\$0

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 001-SS-09

INSTITUTION: Bossier Parish Community College

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Film, Video and Audio Post Production Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Larry Powell

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2 (of 3 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 5 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 62 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$140,763
 RECOMMENDATIONS: 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 adequate but repetitive and, in the end, unpersuasive. The pedagogy is vague; specific examples of how the courses will lead to technology skills would help. Is Avid technology, in fact, where the industry is going? Were other options explored? The outcomes assessment is not very well presented, and repeated assertions that students will use technology are not compelling. The pre-test and post-test items on page 10 do not line up consistently, leading to questions concerning the precision of the assessment. The impact on faculty is not adequately or persuasively made clear. The panel does not recommend funding.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 13 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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 _____

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 002SS-09

INSTITUTION: Dillard University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Dillard University Educational Clearinghouse of Economic Statistics
(ECHOES) about Hurricane Katrina

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kim Coleman

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

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

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 7 (of 12 points)

**D. Economic and/or Cultural
Development and Impact**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 0 (of 2 points)
 D.2a (For S/E)
 or (of 10 points)
 D.2b 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 20 points)
 B.3 15 (of 25 points)
 B.4 2 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes No x

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No

G. Total Score: 46 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS: Requested Amount: \$86,618
 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 is a very good idea in principle, but the project is naïve in design and in the expectations of results. The proposal is too vague: the nature of the data to be gathered needs greater specification. How does one gather data without clear hypotheses or a clear research design? The link between the plan and student learning is not as sharply described as it should be. Indeed, one does not need a project like this to teach students about Hurricane Katrina, economics, or how to do a case study. How the faculty will utilize the data is difficult to determine, given no clear research design. Overall the project, if it is to be done well, requires far more than one junior faculty member and a bunch of undergraduates. This is major scholarship and requires a stronger team and much more time than is anticipated to bring it off. The cooperation with the University of Houston should be guaranteed before the proposal is submitted, not after. In short, this project appears excessively ambitious, and the panel doubts it can be implemented as panned. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 003SS-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana State University and A&M College-Alexandria

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement Plan for the Bachelor of Arts in Communication
Studies at Louisiana State University at Alexandria

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Doran O'Donnell

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$362,120</u>	<u>\$15,410</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$81,000</u>	<u>\$0</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 is a straightforward start-up project intended to take a minimalist program to a high-end level, seeking to make a major leap forward. The Mac computer lab would serve a wide number of students and purposes and it is the strongest part of the proposal. The proposal is vague in many places, lacking crispness and precision; there is an unclear intellectual vision of the program and little explanation of the overall purpose. The institutional match for the lab is noteworthy. There is a real question concerning the need for and overall value of the studio, especially since the trend in the discipline seems to be away from studio-based programs. The State of Louisiana already has high-end programs in place. Is one needed in Alexandria? Assessment is weak; the reliance on student surveys is not a persuasive measure of the learning or project outcomes; something more direct is needed. Funding is recommended for the Mac lab only. The institutional match may be reduced proportionally.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 004SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula in
Political Science: Approaches to Teaching the Study of Politics

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen A. Bratton

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) _____

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

C.1 8 (of 12 points)

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

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

B. The Enhancement Plan
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 15 (of 20 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources
(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 0 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes _____ No x

G. Total Score: 68 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$23,950</u>	<u>\$43,740</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</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 is sensible but not compelling. It is not clear how many faculty or students will be affected by the project, nor that having graduate students teach the undergraduate research course is the most effective instructional strategy. The online workshop is intriguing, but it is not precisely described or well explained, leading one to wonder if this has been thought out. The link between successful implementation of this project and the achievement of the broader goals is not sufficiently explained. The plan for assessment of outcomes is not strong, and it is not clear that the Board would be able to measure success. Finally, the institutional salary match is not clear: does this mean a course buyout? Is it real and consequential? The proposal is a bit of a "grab bag" of initiatives that are largely matters that should be done routinely. The importance of the speakers series is not persuasively argued. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 005SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Cognitive Science Research Activities
through Improved Computer Technology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Emily M. Elliott

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 73 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 1 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$45,348
 RECOMMENDATIONS: 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 is a sensible proposal. The importance of the hardware is obvious, given the intentions of the proposal, but the description of the equipment's and software's capabilities relative to the educational goals could have been more detailed. The current situation is not described well. The research projects are sound, but it is not clear how this particular equipment will facilitate them. There should be an explicit explanation of how the instructional function will be enhanced. Finally, the achievement and measurement of project success are not made clear. The panel recommends partial funding and believes that the software costs should be covered by the department, college, or University. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 006SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Doubling Capacity of Media Effects Lab

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert K. Goidel

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
B.2 12 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 1 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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 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 Requested Amount: \$103,255

RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$103,255

(If additional funds become available)

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

This is a sound proposal from a well-established group of scholars in a strong school. The proposal essentially asks for two additional eye-trackers to enhance the two already in operation. The rationale seems to be that being able to handle a larger number of subjects will enhance prospects for grants and improve student training. These assertions must be taken on faith. The question is whether the degree of enhancement is sufficient to warrant the funds requested, especially relative to other worthy proposals. The panel recommends full funding if additional funds become available.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 007SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Equipment Enhancement for Geospatial Data Management

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Farrell W. Jones

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)	

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)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1	<u> 3 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.2	<u> 11 </u>	(of 15 points)
B.3	<u> 16 </u>	(of 20 points)
B.4	<u> 3 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.5	<u> 1 </u>	(of 2 points)
B.6	<u> 2 </u>	(of 5 points)
B.7	Yes <u> x </u>	No <u> </u>

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1	<u> 11 </u>	(of 12 points)
-----	--------------	----------------

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

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

G. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

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

H. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u> \$110,900 </u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u> \$110,000 </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 is a sensible and sound proposal for a top-end file server that is essential to the program. The program is an important one and is well connected to external partners. Strong faculty are involved. The goals and objectives could be more clearly and forcefully described. The work plan is not very detailed. There is not much evidence or argumentation concerning the impact on teaching, pedagogy, or faculty development. The cost sharing appears to be sketchy: assigning staff time to something like this is not very persuasive. The assessment measures are weak. However, this is a worthy project and the panel recommends partial funding with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 008SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Digital Imaging and Visualization in Archaeology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heather McKillop

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____
A.2 4 (of 5 points)
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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 8 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score:

81

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 14 (of 15 points)
B.3 16 (of 20 points)
B.4 3 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$118,343
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$118,000

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 seems to be a very strong and active group of faculty doing important work in their field that extends internationally. They would make good use of the funds. The project promises enhancement of an already strong program. The proposal explicates specific and persuasive intellectual goals, and it shows how the requested equipment serves these goals. The lack of a more tangible and substantial match is disappointing. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 010SS-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Digital Prototyping Studio Upgrade and Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert Fakelmann

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 83 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 14 (of 15 points)
 B.3 17 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY **Requested Amount:** \$149,205
RECOMMENDATIONS: **Recommended Amount:** \$141,000

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 is a strong proposal, well designed and well written

This is a well designed and well written proposal. It would be stronger if there were concrete examples (such as an illustration of a product) of how the equipment will work in practice. The performance measures do not adequately address the educational or instructional outcomes (the description is about "inputs" rather than achievement), but the faculty involved constitute a strong group that undoubtedly will deliver on their promises and utilize the equipment well. The panel recommends partial funding, with the institutional match to be maintained in full. The University should fund the two desktop and two laptop computers.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 011SS-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: RECRUITS: Resources to Enhance College Recruiting of Undergraduate Incoming and Transfer Students

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score:

59

 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 9 (of 15 points)
B.3 11 (of 20 points)
B.4 1 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$122,727
RECOMMENDATIONS: 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 is a weak proposal with two major flaws. First, it is not clear why the Enhancement Program should support recruitment of students to one particular major, presumably at the expense of another. Second, it is not clear that the proposed equipment or the dedication of the faculty's time and effort will achieve the stated goals. The fact that there is no institutional match speaks volumes about the inherent importance of this proposal to the University. Perhaps it would be better to focus on one key aspect, such as the summer academy, and resubmit or seek funding elsewhere. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 012SS-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Design: From Ideas to Retail

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Kathleen Heiden

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$38,621
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$38,500

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

This is an appropriate request by the department faculty to enhance the tools of their trade. The potential for links to the textile industry strengthens the project. The proposal itself is not as well written as it should be, and it is repetitive. The plan for assessing the achievement of objectives is weak. There is a need for objective measures of increased student learning. Many of the expected results are couched in the conditional tense. The precise nature of the "enhancement" of courses and the overall education of students is unclear. An example or two would help. These weaknesses notwithstanding, the panel recommends partial funding. The panel does not recommend funding for shipping and handling and believes the University should be willing to cover those costs.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

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 x No _____

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 013SS-09

INSTITUTION: Louisiana Tech University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: LEADER (Leadership Education, Assessment, and Development through Empowerment and Responsibility) in Human Ecology

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lori A. Myers

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)

C. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 8 (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 6 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 15 (of 20 points)
 B.3 18 (of 25 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

E. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

E.1 1 (of 4 points)

F. Previous Support Fund Awards

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes x No _____

G. Total Score: 66 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$22,465
RECOMMENDATIONS: 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 is a marginal proposal with some redeeming values, such as the notion of leadership development. The leadership education component, however, is inadequately described and conceptualized. There is little actual leadership experience in the program. A "ropes" course and some lectures and films do not constitute leadership training. The assessment portion of the plan yields a relatively weak set of results that may or may not measure leadership development. How does a student demonstrate leadership? The "performance measures" are not measures; they are goals and objectives. The panel was also disappointed in the institutional match and does not recommend funding for the proposal.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 014SS-09

INSTITUTION: Northwestern State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: State-of-the-Art Documentation Equipment to Enhance Northwestern State University's Heritage Resources Program's HRGIS Facility

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: ElizaBeth Guin

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 12 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$155,506
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$155,300

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

This is a sound proposal from a solid program linked to the National Parks Service, and it is worthy of funding. However, there are issues in the proposal that the writers might wish to consider. The proposal often lacks clarity and precision and it is too wordy. It is often repetitive and contains too much information that is only marginally useful. It is not clear how many students will be affected. The proposal fails to explain exactly what the equipment will do and the consequences thereof. The institutional match is claimed to be significant, but there is no explanation of the biggest item in the budget justification, listed in the budget in the category "G. Other". The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 015SS-09

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of School of Social Work Research Capacity

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Ronald J. Mancoske

A. The Current Situation

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes x No _____
 A.2 1 (of 5 points)
 A.3 0 (of 5 points)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 2 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 3 (of 3 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 4 (For NS/NE)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 2 (of 5 points)
 B.2 10 (of 15 points)
 B.3 10 (of 20 points)
 B.4 15 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 9 (of 12 points)

F. Additional Funding Sources

(Total of 4 Points)

F.1 x (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.)

	<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:		
Requested Amount:	<u>\$58,500</u>	<u>\$44,450</u>
Recommended Amount:	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</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.)

The proposal is very vague and hard to follow, and is laden with disciplinary jargon. It is not clear exactly what is going to be done, why much of this requires Enhancement Program funding, or how this will enhance eminence. The description of current activity is very useful, but questions remain as to precisely what the impact of the project will be and how it can be measured. Because the equipment is a minor portion of the proposal, why is this submitted as primarily an equipment request? Most of the funding is for training, yet training receives little attention in the proposal. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 016SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: High-Definition Television (HDTV) Enhancement for
Television Studio and Control Room

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Heidi C. Bordogna

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2 (of 3 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 6 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 11 (of 12 points)

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 x No _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$524,463
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$417,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This is a well written proposal, but the need is not clearly presented. It is an expensive, high-end solution to the issues of broadcast education. The proposal conflates digital video (crucial to broadcast education and an area of accreditation concern) with HDTV (not required for accreditation). The assessment section is weak. It is not truly clear how this is going to make a big impact on students' education, which for half a million dollars would seem crucial. How will we know if this project is successful in enhancing education and elevating the department's effectiveness and prestige? Due to the limited funds available for this competition, however, the sheer size of the proposal makes it very difficult to fund relative to other very worthy proposals. That said, this is a well-crafted enhancement initiative and the panel recommends partial funding if additional funds become available, with the institutional match maintained in full. The University should cover costs of lighting and miscellaneous items.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 017SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Textile Testing Laboratory

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jacqueline Robeck

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 5 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 3 (of 3 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 6 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 71 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 14 (of 20 points)
 B.4 4 (of 5 points)
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)
 B.6 4 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 8 (of 12 points)

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 _____

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$102,603
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$95,000

(If additional funds become available)

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

This proposal would serve three programs which spreads the potential impact. However, there are questions about the academic value of this. The intellectual importance and consequences are not clearly or persuasively indicated. The project's goals seem to lie in the realm of technical details in the process, details that students might well need to know; but do they need this kind of equipment? Why do they want to do this testing? If this were a program relating to the creation of new textiles, this would be a stronger proposal. Are the textiles coming from Louisiana? Are they just bringing in materials to test so that students know how testing is done? These questions are not answered, though presumably they could be. Given the project's potential impact, however, the panel recommends funding for the equipment only if additional funds become available. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 018SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Monroe

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Library Special Collections Digitization Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Cynthia Robertson

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 6 (of 6 points)
 C.2 1 (of 1 point)
 C.3 2 (of 3 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 8 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 74 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$28,031
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$25,200

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 rationale of the proposal is clear: to make special collections material more available and preserve it. These are worthy objectives. There are some valuable documents worthy of preservation and dissemination. However, the curriculum and student retention aspects are limited in scope. This equipment helps prepare for future acquisitions as well. The only questions concern the relative importance of this proposal with respect to other proposals and the nature of the demand for these materials even if they are digitized. The panel recommends partial funding. The university should cover the costs of installation, software, and supplies. The institutional match should be maintained in full.

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 13 (of 15 points)
 B.3 16 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 0 (of 2 points)
 B.6 2 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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 _____

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 019SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving the Earl K. Long Library Learning Commons by
Creating Collaborative Workspaces and Providing Easy
Access to Digitization on Demand

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Lora Amsberryaugier

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

C.1 3 (of 6 points)
C.2 1 (of 1 point)
C.3 2 (of 3 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 6 (For NS/NE)

H. Total Score: 60 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 3 (of 5 points)
B.2 10 (of 15 points)
B.3 13 (of 20 points)
B.4 2 (of 5 points)
B.5 0 (of 2 points)
B.6 3 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes _____ No x

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$24,529
RECOMMENDATIONS: 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 is a modest proposal requesting computers and a "walk-up" scanner, the educational value of which is not entirely obvious. The case for the enhancement aspect is not well made. The proposal is not organized and presented according to the guidelines. There is no plan for assessment of goal achievement (the goals listed at the outset). Overall, the project is marginal when considered against the other proposals. The panel does not recommend funding.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 020SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving the Mental Health of New Orleans Post-Katrina:
Restoration of the University of New Orleans Psychology
Department Psychology Clinic

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Michelle Martel

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)

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

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)
B.2 17 (of 20 points)
B.3 21 (of 25 points)
B.4 4 (of 5 points)
B.5 2 (of 2 points)
B.6 4 (of 5 points)
B.7 Yes x No _____

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: 81 (of 100 points)

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

		<u>YEAR 1</u>	<u>YEAR 2</u>
SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:	Requested Amount:	<u>\$94,095</u>	<u>\$73,176*</u>
	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$94,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</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 is a strong proposal, though the budget justification is poorly organized, hard to follow, and lacks detail. There are some typographical errors, such as the substitution of "capitol" for "capital" and "impetuous" for "impetus". It is not clear precisely what the faculty salary funds are buying: how much teaching time is being released? Moreover, the 35% salary seems to exceed the 25% salary limit, unless some of this is requested for summer. This matter must be clarified before a contract is issued. The budget for the second year exceeds the allowable \$50,000. The panel's biggest question is whether UNO will guarantee continued operation of the clinic and support for graduate students once the grant period has expired. There are indications that UNO is committed to the project (e.g., restoration of the facilities). The expectation is that clinic fees will sustain the operation, but that is uncertain. Overall, however, this is an important idea and a worthwhile project. The panel recommends partial funding, with reductions to be made at the discretion of the principal investigator. The institutional match must be maintained in full.

*The RFP restricts 2nd year funding to no more than \$50,000.

RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 021SS-09

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Infrastructure Enhancement for 4K Digital Cinema Production Pipeline

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Robert M. Racine

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)

C. Equipment

(Total of 10 Points)

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

H. Total Score: 72 (of 100 points)

B. The Enhancement Plan

(Total of 52 Points)

B.1 4 (of 5 points)
 B.2 11 (of 15 points)
 B.3 15 (of 20 points)
 B.4 3 (of 5 points)
 B.5 1 (of 2 points)
 B.6 3 (of 5 points)
 B.7 Yes x No _____

D. Faculty and Staff Expertise

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 10 (of 12 points)

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

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount: \$286,433
 RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount: \$286,433

(If additional funds become available)

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

This is a solid proposal that the panel would like to fund if it were not so costly and if enough money was available. This is cutting edge technology that represents a major step forward for the program, as well as a significant expense; it is likely that the cost of this equipment will decrease in time, suggesting possibilities for future funding. One weakness is that the individuals responsible for the work plan are not specifically identified. The institutional match is impressive. The panel recommends full funding if additional funding becomes available.

Appendix A

Summary List of Proposals

Complete List: Enhancement Program: TR Proposals: Social Sciences

Count	PI Name	Categories	Project Title	Amount Requested			Institution
				Year 1	Year2	Total	
001SS-09	Powell, Larry	Social Sciences	Film, Video and Audio Post Production Laboratory	\$140,763	\$0	\$140,763	Bossier Parish Community College
002SS-09	Coleman, Kim	Social Sciences	Dillard University Educational Clearinghouse of Economic Statistics (ECHOES) about Hurricane Katrina	\$86,618	\$0	\$86,618	Dillard University
003SS-09	ODonnell, Doran	Social Sciences	Enhancement Plan for the Bachelor of Arts in Communication Studies at Louisiana State University at Alexandria	\$362,120	\$15,410	\$377,530	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Alexandria
004SS-09	Bratton, Kathleen	Social Sciences	Enhancement of Graduate and Undergraduate Curricula in Political Science: Approaches to Teaching the Study of Politics	\$23,950	\$43,740	\$67,690	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
005SS-09	Elliott, Emily	Social Sciences	Enhancement of Cognitive Science Research Activities through Improved Computer Technology	\$45,348	\$0	\$45,348	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
006SS-09	Goidel, Robert	Social Sciences	Doubling Capacity of Media Effects Lab	\$103,255	\$0	\$103,255	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
007SS-09	Jones, Farrell	Social Sciences	Equipment Enhancement for Geospatial Data Management	\$110,900	\$0	\$110,900	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge

008SS-09	McKillop, Heather	Social Sciences	Digital Imaging and Visualization in Archaeology	\$118,343	\$0	\$118,343	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
009SS-09	Saunders, Rebecca	Social Sciences	Controlling the Past for the Future: A Proposal for the Enhancement of Physical and Virtual Access to the Archaeological Collections at the LSUMNS	\$195,993	\$0	\$195,993	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge
010SS-09	Fakelmann, Robert	Social Sciences	The Digital Prototyping Studio Upgrade and Enhancement	\$149,205	\$0	\$149,205	Louisiana Tech University
011SS-09	Heiden, Kathleen	Social Sciences	RECRUITS: Resources to Enhance College Recruiting of Undergraduate Incoming and Transfer Students	\$122,727	\$0	\$122,727	Louisiana Tech University
012SS-09	Heiden, Kathleen	Social Sciences	Design: From Ideas to Retail	\$38,621	\$0	\$38,621	Louisiana Tech University
013SS-09	Myers, Lori	Social Sciences	LEADER (Leadership Education, Assessment, and Development through Empowerment and Responsibility) in Human Ecology	\$22,465	\$0	\$22,465	Louisiana Tech University
014SS-09	Guin, ElizaBeth	Social Sciences	“State-of-the-Art Documentation Equipment to Enhance Northwestern State University’s Heritage Resources Program’s HRGIS Facility”	\$155,506	\$0	\$155,506	Northwestern State University

015SS-09	Mancoske, Ronald	Social Sciences	Enhancement of School of Social Work Research Capacity	\$58,500	\$44,450	\$102,950	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans
016SS-09	Bordogna, Heidi	Social Sciences	HIGH-DEFINITION TELEVISION (HDTV) ENHANCEMENT FOR TELEVISION STUDIO AND CONTROL ROOM	\$524,463	\$0	\$524,463	University of Louisiana at Lafayette
017SS-09	Robeck, Jacqueline	Social Sciences	Textile Testing Laboratory	\$102,603	\$0	\$102,603	University of Louisiana at Lafayette
018SS-09	Robertson, Cynthia	Social Sciences	Library Special Collections Digitization Project	\$28,031	\$0	\$28,031	University of Louisiana at Monroe
019SS-09	Amsberryaugier, Lora	Social Sciences	Improving the Earl K. Long Library Learning Commons by creating collaborative workspaces and providing easy access to digitization on demand	\$24,529	\$0	\$24,529	University of New Orleans
020SS-09	Martel, Michelle	Social Sciences	Improving the Mental Health of New Orleans Post-Katrina: Restoration of the University of New Orleans Psychology Department Psychology Clinic	\$94,095	\$73,176	\$167,271	University of New Orleans
021SS-09	Racine, Robert	Social Sciences	Infrastructure Enhancement for 4K Digital Cinema Production Pipeline	\$286,433	\$0	\$286,433	University of New Orleans

Total Number of Proposals submitted	21
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$2,794,468

Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$176,776.00
Total Money Requested	\$2,971,243.79

Appendix B

Rating Forms

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

Page 1 of 3

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2008-09

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)/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 52 points

- _____ of 5 pts. B.1 Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? Can the objectives be completed within the timeframe detailed in the proposal?
- _____ of 15 pts. B.2 Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated?
- _____ of 20 pts. B.3 To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.4 To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged?
- _____ of 2 pts. B.5 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana?
- _____ of 5 pts. B.6 To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project?
- No Points Given, but this is a required component. B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

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:

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 2008-09
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 5 pts. | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? |
| _____ of 20 pts. | B.2 | Does the work plan sufficiently describe the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives of the proposal with responsible individuals listed for each activity, a schedule of activities with benchmarks to be accomplished, and a description detailing how each objective will be evaluated? |
| _____ of 25 pts. | B.3 | To what extent will the proposed project catapult the department(s) or unit(s) into attaining a high level of regional, national, or international eminence--or maintaining a current high level of eminence--commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.4 | To what extent will the proposed project have an impact on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s)? Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, is reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation encouraged? |
| _____ of 2 pts. | B.5 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the ability of the department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high quality students from Louisiana? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | B.6 | To what extent will the project contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching and improve faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project? |

No Points Given,
But this is a required
component

B.7 Does the proposal indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether or not the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals?

COMMENTS:

B. 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:

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: _____