

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

**ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

Guidelines for the Submission of

**Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Proposals**

(This RFP excludes the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions.)

**Proposals Due:  
October 24, 2011  
4:30 p.m.**

**FISCAL YEAR 2011-12**

Request for Proposals, Number 2011-05

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<http://web.laregents.org>

Revised: 6/2011

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS NUMBER 2011-05

## IMPORTANT NOTICES

**1. Inquiries about this RFP**

In accordance with R.S. 39:1503, written and oral inquiries about this request for proposals (RFP) will be accepted until 4:30 p.m., **October 1, 2011**. Inquiries about the Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Programs RFP, Number 2011-05, should be directed to Ms. Noreen Lockett, Enhancement Program Manager, at (225) 342-4253 or [noreen.lockett@la.gov](mailto:noreen.lockett@la.gov), or Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, at (225) 342-4253 or [bryan.jones@la.gov](mailto:bryan.jones@la.gov). No inquiry will be accepted—whether written or oral—after that date. Operating in this manner ensures that all interested parties receive the same information.

**2. Suggestions for Improvements in this RFP**

The Board of Regents actively solicits constructive suggestions about ways in which this RFP can be improved. All such suggestions must be received no later than October 1, 2011 to be considered prior to the issuance of the next RFP.

**3. Board of Regents Commitment to Reform-Based Undergraduate Education and Teacher Preparation**

At its May 22, 1997, meeting, the Board of Regents reaffirmed its commitment to the reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation and encouraged all Support Fund program applicants to consider these priorities as they develop proposals. Further, Board staff will make all external reviewers aware of the Board's commitment to undergraduate reform and teacher preparation. Reviewers will be instructed that, when all else is equal, preference should be given to those proposals which emphasize, in a meaningful manner, reform-based undergraduate education and teacher preparation.

**4. Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions**

Regulations governing proposal submission for FY 2011-12 under the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions will be promulgated in a separate RFP.

**5. Availability of the RFP on the Internet**

As part of the Board's ongoing effort to streamline RFPs, and to ensure that this document is as widely disseminated as possible, this RFP is available on the Internet: <http://web.laregents.org/downloads/rfps-policies-forms>.

**6. Proposal Submission Deadlines**

Electronic proposal submissions are due on October 24, 2011 by 4:30 p.m. If this date falls on a holiday or weekend, proposals are due by 4:30 p.m. on the following working weekday.

Enhancement Program proposals will be submitted through the Louisiana Online Grant Automation Network (LOGAN). This RFP includes directions for submitting the electronic proposal, which the applicant should print for his or her own records.

For help with electronic submission, please e-mail Karthik, LOGAN Administrator, [karthik@la.gov](mailto:karthik@la.gov), before **October 18, 2011**.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. General Information.....	1
A. Basis of Authority .....	1
B. Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund .....	1
C. Public Nature of Proposals Submitted.....	1
D. Enhancement Program Administrator; Questions About This RFP .....	1
II. Types of Enhancement Subprograms.....	2
III. The Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Programs .....	2
A. Objectives.....	2
B. Eligibility Considerations.....	2
1. Eligible Faculty.....	2
2. Eligible Institutions.....	2
3. Eligible Activities .....	3
4. Eligibility of Duplicate Proposals.....	3
5. Eligible Disciplines.....	3
C. Monetary Limitations .....	4
D. Duration.....	5
E. Funds Available.....	5
1. Traditional Enhancement Program .....	5
2. Undergraduate Enhancement Program .....	5
F. Cost Sharing and Matching Commitments.....	5
G. Institutional Screening Committee .....	5
H. Assessment of Proposals by Out-of-State Experts .....	6
I. Final Selection of Proposals to be Funded .....	6
J. Debriefing.....	6
K. Timetable.....	6
L. Post-Award Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required.....	6
M. Eligibility of Continuation Proposals.....	6
IV. Procedures and Deadline for Submission of Proposals.....	7
V. Proposal Requirements and Format .....	7
Appendix A: Taxonomy of Disciplines	
Appendix B: Sample Proposal Evaluation Forms	

## **I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

### **A. BASIS OF AUTHORITY**

Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution established two funds in the State Treasury: the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) and the Board of Regents Support Fund (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received from settlement of disputed oil and gas revenues generated in the so-called 8(g) section of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of money in the Trust Fund, as well as 25% of recurring 8(g) oil and gas revenues, will continue to be returned to the Trust Fund, until it reaches a cap of \$2 billion. Each fiscal year the remaining 75% of the interest earned and 75% of the recurring oil and gas revenues are placed in the Support Fund for appropriation by the Legislature.

### **B. PURPOSES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**

On an annual basis, Support Fund money is divided equally between the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) and the Board of Regents (hereinafter referred to as the Board) for higher education. According to Article VII of the Constitution, the funds available to higher education from the Support Fund are to be utilized " . . . as that money is appropriated by the Legislature and allocated by the Board of Regents for any or all of the following higher educational purposes to enhance economic development:

1. the carefully defined research efforts of public and private universities in Louisiana;
2. the endowment of chairs for eminent scholars;
3. the enhancement of the quality of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units within a university; and,
4. the recruitment of superior graduate students."

The Article further stipulates that "the monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education. . . ."

Reflecting these Constitutional mandates, the Board of Regents' "Policy for Administration of Funds Received from the Board of Regents Support Fund" (hereinafter referred to as the Board's Policy for Administration), adopted in October 1986, affirms that awards in all categories will be based on the following considerations:

1. the potential for the award to enhance the overall quality of higher education in Louisiana; and
2. the potential for the award to enhance the economic development of the State.

### **C. PUBLIC NATURE OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED**

Once a proposal is received in the Board's office, it becomes public record. The Board's staff, of its own accord, will not disseminate proposals to individuals other than to external reviewers; however, applicants should be aware that, if a request for a proposal is made by the public (e.g., a representative of the news media), a copy of the proposal, by law, must be provided.

### **D. ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS; QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RFP**

Specific questions concerning this RFP and the requirements set forth herein should be directed to Ms. Noreen Lockett, Enhancement Program Manager, or Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, (225) 342-4253 or [noreen.lockett@la.gov](mailto:noreen.lockett@la.gov) or [bryan.jones@la.gov](mailto:bryan.jones@la.gov). In compliance with R.S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 1, 2011. As soon as possible after that date, all questions asked about this RFP and answers provided in response to these questions will be transcribed and posted on the Sponsored Programs website, <http://web.laregents.org>. To ensure that all parties receive the same information, no inquiries, whether oral or written, will be accepted after the deadline.

## II. TYPES OF ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAMS

The Enhancement Program consists of five components: the Endowed Professorships Program; Endowed Undergraduate Scholarships for First-Generation College Students; the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions; the Traditional Enhancement Program (including multidisciplinary); and the Undergraduate Enhancement Program. Potential applicants should be aware that: (1) the requirements for these programs vary; and (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals. The Endowed Professorships, Endowed Undergraduate Scholarships, and Two-Year Enhancement programs are explained in detail in other documents available on the Sponsored Programs website.

### **THIS RFP CONTAINS INFORMATION RELEVANT TO THE TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS ONLY.**

## III. THE TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS

### A. **OBJECTIVES**

Based on Constitutional and legislative mandates and policies adopted by the Board, proposals will be considered in the Enhancement Program whose objectives are to enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units and to promote economic development.

The impact of the proposed project on the enhancement of departments and units--and on the State's economy--may be subtle, indirect, and delayed, or pronounced, direct, and immediate. Special consideration will be given to:

1. imaginative projects which seek opportunities not otherwise available;
2. projects which will be funded in part by an external agency; and
3. projects which have a broad impact, strengthening the infrastructure of departments and units.

### B. **ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS**

1. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only those individuals affiliated with an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists and/or engineers, or employees of industry) may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal or co-investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal.
2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:**
  - a. **TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** The Board's Policy for Administration stipulates that departments and units at public four-year institutions of higher education, two-year institutions which are members of the Louisiana Community and Technical College System, and regionally accredited independent institutions of higher education which are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities are eligible to compete under the Traditional Enhancement Program. Technical colleges are not eligible to compete unless they collaborate with a two- or four-year eligible institution.
  - b. **UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** The Undergraduate Enhancement Program was created by the Board to affirm the principle that improvement of infrastructure is essential at all academic levels and to encourage colleges and universities without sizable graduate programs to participate in the Support Fund Enhancement Program. Additional prerequisites for participation in this program are as follows: (1) the campus must offer two or fewer doctoral programs; and (2) the department applying must not offer a doctoral degree. Participation in this program will not preclude these campuses from competing for other Enhancement money, and quality considerations will continue to form the basis for all funding decisions.

- c. **MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS:** For those applications which propose to share resources among several institutions, the following rules/statements apply:
  - i) Applications of this type must be submitted under the appropriate eligible discipline.
  - ii) The application must be submitted by a single lead institution. Partnering institutions must be referenced on the cover page of the application under the heading "Additional Institutions." Documentation that defines the role(s) of the partner institutions must be submitted as an appendix to the proposal (see RFP section V.C).
  - iii) Only one comprehensive budget page for the project is to be submitted for each year of the proposal. Subcontracted budgets for partnering institutions must be described in the budget justification and referenced in the work plan.
  - iv) If awarded, the grant will be managed fiscally by the lead institution.
- d. **SPECIAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS:** For those applications which propose projects that are rooted in one of the five eligible disciplines but enhance the study of multiple disciplines and benefit multiple departments/units, the following rules/statements apply:
  - i) The category "special multidisciplinary" must be selected on the proposal cover page.
  - ii) Applications must be firmly rooted in one of the five eligible disciplines, though projects may include disciplines and partner with departments/units that are not eligible during the year of submission.
  - iii) Applicants must identify only the single, root discipline on the cover page. However, the participation of partner disciplines should be clearly documented throughout the remaining sections of the application.
  - iv) All special multidisciplinary applications will be reviewed by a separate multidisciplinary panel composed of individuals with a broad range of expertise. Of the total available for expenditure in Traditional Enhancement, 20% has been allocated in the Plan and Budget for awards in this category in FY 2011-12.
  - v) Proposals for institution-wide enhancement projects that are rooted outside of the study of disciplines in individual departments or units are discouraged. Applicants should not claim that the project is eligible because a number of or all disciplines will indirectly benefit through the improvement of services available to the entire institution. Multidisciplinary projects, like all Enhancement projects, should directly enhance individual academic departments or units (see Constitutional language quoted in Section I.B.3).
3. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:** Any activity is eligible as long as the applicant can argue convincingly that it will enhance the infrastructure of the particular academic, research, or agricultural department or unit involved.
4. **ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS:** The same (or a very similar) proposal may not be submitted in the same year for funding consideration in the Undergraduate Enhancement, Traditional Enhancement, and the Two-Year Enhancement Programs.
5. **ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES:** In June of 1988, the Board of Regents adopted a ten-year Strategic Plan for Higher Education's Portion of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund, which was subsequently updated in 1993, 1999, and 2006. The 2006 Strategic Plan sets forth the years in which certain disciplines are eligible to participate. Potential applicants should note that: (1) the **topic** of the proposal should be used to determine eligibility, not the academic training of the potential applicants; and (2) **eligible disciplines for FY 2011-12 through FY 2016-17 are presented in Table I.**

**TABLE I:**

**ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT\***

**GROUP I – ELIGIBLE FYs 2011-12, 2014-15**

Biological Sciences  
Computer and Information Sciences  
Engineering B (Industrial, Materials, Mechanical, etc.)  
Humanities  
Social Sciences

**GROUP II – ELIGIBLE FYs 2012-13, 2015-16**

Agricultural Sciences  
Arts  
Earth/Environmental Sciences  
Engineering A (Chemical, Civil, Electrical, etc.)  
Health and Medical Sciences

**GROUP III – ELIGIBLE FYs 2013-14, 2016-17**

Business  
Chemistry  
Education  
Mathematics  
Physics/Astronomy

\*See the attached listing of those sub-disciplines which are included in these larger groupings in Appendix A.

**C. MONETARY LIMITATIONS**

Except under extraordinary circumstances, proposals should request no less than \$5,000 and no more than \$1 million each. Applicants should be aware, however, that the average total award in the FY 2010-11 competition was approximately \$98,087 in Traditional Enhancement, with first-year awards ranging from \$7,500 to \$293,641, and \$64,229 in Undergraduate Enhancement, with first-year awards ranging from \$13,583 to \$137,000.

In an attempt to limit the commitment of future Support Fund monies, equipment may only be purchased in the initial year of a project and, for projects which envision multi-year funding, the following stipulations apply: (1) no project may be of more than two years in duration (except if an extension is granted); (2) no project may request more than \$50,000 in the second year; and (3) a limit of \$1 million has been placed on the total of all second-year commitments in the Enhancement Program.

**D. DURATION**

No proposal may seek more than two (2) years of support through the Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement programs. When other criteria for evaluation are equal, preference will be given to one-year projects. Two-year proposals will be funded only in exceptional circumstances and only when substantial justification has been provided.

**E. FUNDS AVAILABLE**

A total of \$25,600,000 was estimated to be available for the FY 2011-12 Board of Regents Support Fund budget for higher education. However, it should be noted that FY 2010-11 income was drastically reduced from projections made by the Revenue Estimating Conference. A similar situation could recur in FY 2011-12, resulting in reductions to funds available for new awards.

1. **TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** Approximately \$2.5 million is anticipated to be available in FY 2011-12 for the first year's work of new Traditional Enhancement projects. The final amount of money that will be available is contingent on Support Fund income realized. As indicated in Section III.B.2.d.iv, 20% of the amount available is reserved for special multidisciplinary proposals.
2. **UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** For FY 2011-12, the Board has dedicated a maximum of \$1.62 million for the first year's work of new Enhancement grants to be awarded to State institutions and departments eligible under this subprogram. The final amount is contingent on Support Fund income realized.

**F. COST SHARING AND MATCHING COMMITMENTS**

Potential applicants and university officials should note that any institutional cost-sharing commitments are binding. For this reason, the Board of Regents strongly encourages institutions of higher education to make only those commitments that they can realistically meet. Institutions should also be aware that discounts received on equipment purchases are not eligible for inclusion as part of an institutional match.

Applicants and their fiscal agents should be aware that cost sharing and matching commitments of any kind (e.g., private sector, federal, institutional) which are pledged in the proposal must be honored in full if the proposal is funded at the requested level. Depending upon consultants' recommendations, matching commitments may have to be honored in full even if the award level is reduced. Support Fund money will not be forwarded until appropriate written assurances of all matches and cost sharing promised in the proposal have been received, reviewed, and approved by the Board's staff. Institutional approval is granted by the electronic submission of the proposal to the Board through each institution's Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), and is a certification to the Board that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and/or statutes. Similarly, the fiscal agent's signature, which is required on the budget page(s) of funded projects, is a certification to the Board that commitments pledged in the proposal have been honored. All matching funds must meet the same tests of allowability as Support Fund money requested.

**G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE**

The Board's Policy for Administration requires that proposals be carefully screened by a campus committee to ensure that: (1) no conflict of interest exists (as defined in the "Code of Governmental Ethics," R. S. 1950, as amended, Title 42, Chapter 15); and (2) only the most meritorious proposals from each campus, which meet objectives and eligibility requirements as defined in this RFP are submitted to the Board.

Submission of the proposal by the OSP is considered a guarantee that no conflict of interest exists and that the proposal: (1) has been reviewed and approved for submission to the Board by all appropriate institutional officials who regularly are required to review proposals submitted for external review, including the submitting organization's authorized fiscal officer; (2) has met the objectives, eligibility requirements, and all other appropriate criteria as set forth in this RFP (e.g., the department or unit is eligible to submit a proposal in that year); and (3) is in the format required by the Board.

**H. ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS BY OUT-OF-STATE EXPERTS**

The Board's Policy for Administration stipulates that "all awards (to enhance departments and units) will be subject to external review by an appropriate panel(s) of experts." Accordingly, the Board will select and engage the services of out-of-state experts in the eligible areas. Teams of experts representing the eligible disciplines will individually assess and collectively rank proposals in the appropriate discipline; a separate team will evaluate the special multidisciplinary category.

Proposals will be rated on the extent to which they meet specified criteria. (See rating forms for Enhancement proposals in Appendix B.) Only those proposals which receive average ratings in the range of 70-100 will be eligible to compete for Enhancement funds. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Board fund proposals which receive an average rating of 69 or less.

**I. FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED**

After receiving recommendations from out-of-state experts, the Board determines which proposals will be funded.

**J. DEBRIEFING**

Copies of composite rating forms completed by consultants for each proposal reviewed will be provided as a part of the complete consultants' report to institutions of higher education in April of each year. This is the only debriefing information that will be available for Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement proposals.

**K. TIMETABLE**

Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants will apply for FY 2011-12. **If any deadline dates fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadline(s) will be extended until 4:30 p.m. of the next working weekday.**

July 2011	Request for proposals issued
October 1, 2011	Last day that applicants may ask questions about the RFP
<b>October 24, 2011, 4:30 p.m.</b>	Deadline for receipt of Traditional & Undergraduate Enhancement proposals through LOGAN (including multidisciplinary)
November 2011 – March 2012	Proposals reviewed by out-of-state experts
April 2012	Reports and recommendations of out-of-state experts forwarded to institutions of higher education
April or May 2012	Final action by the Board
May and June 2012	Contracts negotiated and executed

**L. POST-AWARD EVALUATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS AND REPORTS REQUIRED**

The Board's Policy for Administration states that "The Board of Regents will require that institutions receiving monies from the Support Fund report periodically on the utilization of those monies." All programs supported by the Fund will be reviewed at least annually. Data and information collected for review will vary depending upon the type of activity involved, but all information necessary to assess the effectiveness of each project will be gathered. As appropriate, the services of out-of-state experts may be utilized in the evaluation process.

Periodically, the Board will conduct a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of each funded project as part of a general review of academic programs in the relevant disciplines. At a minimum, annual and final progress and financial status reports will be required of the principal investigator.

**M. ELIGIBILITY OF CONTINUATION PROPOSALS**

Submission of a proposal in a previous cycle does not mean that the applicant is relieved of the responsibility of submitting a full proposal if he or she wants the same or a very similar proposal to be considered in the current funding cycle. Proposals that are resubmissions must compete on an equal basis with all other proposals. An applicant submitting a continuation proposal must fully explain in the proposal narrative why he or she wishes to continue the project and summarize the progress to date. The applicant must also indicate on the cover page that the submission is a continuation request by indicating the contract number of the previous project so Board staff is

aware that additional information is included with the continuation proposal. Failure to include the additional information could result in disqualification of the proposal for noncompliance. **The Board discourages the submission of continuation requests in the Enhancement Program.**

#### IV. PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission and must be received electronically through LOGAN. Modules for submitting Enhancement Program proposals are available on LOGAN, which may be accessed at <http://web.laregents.org> by clicking "LOGAN" on the menu at the top of the page. **Paper originals or copies will not be accepted.**

After the applicant submits the completed proposal to his/her campus' OSP, Institutional Advancement, or Grants office via LOGAN, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal will be e-mailed to the applicant and to the campus. **A second e-mail will be sent as soon as possible after the submission deadline indicating whether the proposal has been submitted in compliance with RFP instructions or disqualified for lack of compliance.**

**NOTE: The applicant is responsible for ensuring that the proposal is complete and correct upon submission to the Board, and no changes may be made to any proposal after the submission deadline. Disqualification of a proposal and/or any reviewer misunderstandings that occur because proposal contents (including all required forms) are incomplete, out of order, or contain incorrect information are solely the responsibility of the applicant.**

**Electronic proposals must be approved by the institution's  
Office of Sponsored Programs and submitted via LOGAN  
by 4:30 p.m., October 24, 2011.**

#### V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

The following requirements and format for Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement proposals must be followed closely. Proposals which do not adhere to these guidelines may be disqualified for noncompliance.

Each proposal must include the following information:

- A. **COVER PAGE**: Each item on the cover page must be completed. If the proposal is a continuation request, the additional information requested must be provided.
- B. **PROJECT SUMMARY**: The project summary, limited to 2,500 characters (including spaces), should be a concise description of the project, containing a clear statement of goals and objectives and an outline of the project indicating how the project will operate. The project summary should be informative to other individuals in the same field and should explain how the project meets the objectives of the Enhancement Program.
- C. **NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**: The narrative may not exceed fifteen (15) pages. Biographical sketches, budgets, and budget justifications are not considered part of the narrative section. The narrative should be succinct and avoid repetition. Information applicable in multiple places may be referenced by title of section. Should a section not apply to the project, the heading should be included and marked as "not applicable." Reviewers will assign points based on the quality and specificity of each section. The maximum number of points that can be assigned to each section is noted on the following pages. Proposals that do not conform to page limitations or the prescribed outline may be disqualified.

For multi-institutional proposals, explain as appropriate in each of the following sections the multiple-campus agreement relative to shared funding, resources, and arrangements by which the various institutions will share the

benefits of the proposed project. Documentation must be provided describing the exact nature of the agreement between/among the institutions involved.

**1. THE CURRENT SITUATION [total point value = 10]**

This section should explain the institutional context and the perceived need. It should open with a brief description of the institution, the students it serves, the department(s) involved, and the student clientele for the project. The applicant should not assume that reviewers are acquainted with the institution and its programs. Secondly, this section should describe the relevant resources of the department in order to answer the question: "Is there an adequately supported program into which the present project will fit?" Finally, this section should identify the need that the project would address and answer the question: "What is currently missing from the curriculum or research program or is not being accomplished effectively?"

**a. Institutional Description (0 points, but a required component)**

Describe the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from or support the proposed project, including information on mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources.

**b. Rationale for Project (5 points)**

Summarize briefly the need for the proposed project and how it comprises part of a plan to enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s).

**c. Impact on Existing Resources (5 points)**

Describe the manner and the extent to which the project will complement and improve upon the existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s).

**2. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN [total point value: equipment proposals = 56; non-equipment proposals = 66]**

This section should contain a detailed description of the specific developments and activities intended. This portion of the narrative should enable reviewers to judge the suitability and quality of the planned enhancement(s). **NOTE:** Applicants should review the evaluation forms in Appendix B to determine whether a proposal should be considered an equipment or non-equipment request. The cover page must reflect this determination, as points are allocated differently for each type of proposal.

**a. Project Goals and Objectives (5 points for both equipment and non-equipment proposals)**

Define project goals and measurable objectives.

**b. Work Plan of Proposed Project (equipment proposals = 18 points; non-equipment proposals = 23 points)**

Describe the activities undertaken in the project to achieve the goals and objectives described above. Indicate the person(s) who will conduct each activity. Provide a schedule of activities, with benchmarks to be accomplished throughout the grant period. Describe how each objective will be evaluated.

**c. Evidence of Potential to Achieve Recognized Eminence at the Regional, National, or International Level Commensurate with Degree Offerings and/or Functions (equipment proposals = 20 points; non-equipment proposals = 25 points)**

Explain thoroughly how the proposed project will catapult the department(s) or unit(s) to a high level of eminence, or help to maintain a current high level of eminence, commensurate with degree offerings and/or functions.

**d. Impact on Curriculum and Instruction (5 points)**

Explain the impact which the proposed project will have 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, reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation is encouraged.

**e. Impact on Quality of Students (2 points)**

Explain how the proposed project will enhance the ability of participating department(s) or unit(s) to attract and/or retain students of high quality, particularly high-quality students from Louisiana.

**f. Impact on Faculty Development (6 points)**

Explain how the project will contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching. Improvement of 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 is encouraged.

**g. Performance Measures (0 points, but a required component)**

Indicate how the Board of Regents or other entity will determine whether the project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals.

**3. EQUIPMENT [For equipment proposals only. Total point value = 10]**

This section should answer the questions: "Is each item of equipment requested actually needed to implement this development, is it the right piece of equipment for the job, and is the request appropriate for the department/unit? If the request appears not to be appropriate for the department/unit, has the applicant provided evidence that the request merits special consideration?"

**a. Equipment Request (6 points)**

List each item of equipment requested, with price information. Logical groupings of items should be made, with each entry cross-referenced to the budget page. Special arguments may be needed to explain requests for: (1) apparatus of a quality or cost not usually encountered in research or instruction; (2) equipment which is to be fabricated rather than purchased as a unit; or (3) purchases which might appear to be at variance with the academic setting in which the project would operate. Explain the reasoning behind: (1) choosing the particular equipment and (2) the alternatives which were considered and/or rejected. In the event that an award is made, any items regarded as ineligible, not germane, or inadequately justified will not be funded.

The purpose of this part of the proposal is to establish the precise relationship between the plan described in the previous sections and the items of equipment requested. This section must indicate briefly the manner in which each major equipment item will be used to affect each aspect of the enhancement plan described previously.

**b. Equipment on Hand for Project (1 point)**

This section should answer the question: "Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?" Major equipment on hand that will be available for the project but that is not included in this request should be itemized and explained.

**c. Equipment Housing and Maintenance (3 points)**

This section should answer the question: "Is a reasonable plan presented to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment?" Briefly describe arrangements to house and maintain the equipment. **Please note that Support Fund monies cannot be used to maintain equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund.** If multidisciplinary, interdepartmental, or interinstitutional use of equipment is proposed, describe the plan for effective utilization.

**4. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE [total point value = 12]**

Identify those individuals who will conduct and administer the project, define their roles, and provide their qualifications for undertaking the specific responsibilities assigned to them. Special attention should be given to the Project Director, since accomplishment of the project depends on this person's knowledge of the discipline, the curriculum, and the equipment.

Briefly describe arrangements for any special training of existing personnel and/or for acquisition of needed additional support personnel. These arrangements should reflect the fact that Support Fund monies may not be used to pay faculty from the submitting university to provide training for other faculty at the same university on equipment furnished by Support Fund grants, or any other form of training. **Training should be a part of the institutional match.** In the case of interinstitutional projects, training should be a part of the institutional matching funds provided by the consortium of universities.

**NOTE:** The Biographical Sketch form must be completed for the Project Director and other involved senior personnel. See instructions following the Budget section of this document (V.H).

**5. ECONOMIC AND/OR CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AND IMPACT [total point value = 12]**

This section of the proposal must describe the plan for disseminating the project and/or project benefits to appropriate audiences in Louisiana. The stimulus/leveraging concept in science/engineering proposals mandates that the project contribute to economic development. Non-science/non-engineering projects must, at a minimum, present a plan to leverage Support Fund monies in the manner most appropriate to the proposal. In the case of non-science/non-engineering disciplines, private sector involvement is not necessarily a requirement, if the applicant can justify the lack of involvement.

**a. Relationships With Industrial/Institutional Sponsors (2 points)**

Explain the manner in which the project will assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthening 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, or federal government agency). Also, explain the manner in which funding of the proposed project will enhance prospects of attaining additional external sources of funding.

**b. Promotion of Economic Development and/or Cultural Resources (10 points)**

In the case of projects in science/engineering fields, explain the manner in which the proposed project will assist the submitting department(s)/units(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana. Provide information on both short-term and long-term benefits. In the case of projects in fields other than science/engineering, explain the manner in which the proposed project will contribute to and benefit the academic and/or cultural resources of Louisiana in both the long and short terms.

**6. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES AND EVIDENCE OF COLLABORATION (0 points, but a required component)**

Confirm all resources from collaborating partners by a signed letter describing the form of the commitment to the project. Additional resources may be in the form of cash or in-kind contributions.

Indicate the resources (time and expertise) that appropriate and authorized institutional personnel will provide to the project. Example: The Director of Institutional Research will provide data, store data generated by the project and assist with internal monitoring and evaluation of the project.

**D. PREVIOUS BoR SUPPORT FUND AWARDS:**

If either the prospective Project Director or Co-Director has received support from any Support Fund program during the previous nine (9) years, the proposal must describe the earlier project(s) and outcomes in sufficient detail to permit a reviewer to reach an informed conclusion regarding the value of the results achieved. The following information must be included in this summary statement: (1) Project Director's name, type of award, amount of

award, and period of support; (2) title of the project; (3) a summary of the results of the completed work; and (4) an explanation of the manner in which the current proposal is related to the previous award.

**E. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE/JUSTIFICATION:** (Also see Section III.F of the RFP relative to cost sharing and matching commitments.)

1. An itemized budget must be submitted in the appropriate LOGAN section. Corresponding budget narratives will be uploaded separately. These should fully explain every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds is requested and institutional/private match monies are committed. All funds for which a commitment from an external source has been pledged and which are cited in the narrative section of the proposal must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget narrative. Matching funds should be specified as "in cash" or "in kind."
2. Use State contract prices for equipment purchases where applicable. If having funds available after the proposed Support Fund award terminates is essential to the long-term success or feasibility of the project (e.g., equipment purchased with Support Fund money requires a continuing source of funds for operation and maintenance after a Support Fund award has terminated), the applicant must also provide a "Future Funding Plan" in the budget justification.

**F. DISALLOWED BUDGETARY ITEMS:**

Support Fund monies cannot be used for ongoing operational costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects. As indicated in Section I.B of this RFP, "Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund," Article VII, Section 10.1 of the Louisiana Constitution stipulates that "The monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education . . ." Applicants must make a case in their proposals that what they are proposing does not violate this stipulation. Applicants should also be aware that Support Fund Program staff will make panels of out-of-state evaluators aware of this Constitutional prohibition, as well as the current economic climate for higher education in Louisiana. Panels will then be asked to develop recommendations relative to whether providing Support Fund money for specific proposals under serious consideration would violate this Constitutional stipulation. **Indirect costs may not be requested from the Support Fund, but may be provided as institutional match.**

Also, only with substantial justification and under exceptional circumstances will the Board allocate Support Fund money in the Enhancement Program for maintenance of equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund. These expenses should be provided as match. Applicants should also note that the scope of the program does not permit: (1) construction of facilities; (2) routine renovation or upgrading; (3) paying faculty from the submitting university to train other faculty at the same university, or faculty at other universities who are a part of an interinstitutional project; (4) purchase of motorized vehicles such as cars, vans, boats, etc.; or (5) purchase of standard office furniture or routine office equipment (e.g., copier, desk chairs), although Support Fund money may be requested to furnish specialized equipment essential to the success of a particular project (e.g., tables for computer work stations).

Equipment and supplies purchased with Support Fund monies may not be given to grant participants (faculty, students, teachers, etc.) as personal property during or after the grant period. **Support Fund money may not be requested for equipment or other expenditures, such as teacher or faculty stipends, for K-12 or Louisiana Technical College partners.** These institutions are eligible for funds through the BESE portion of the Support Fund, so may not receive BoRSF monies.

The scope of the Enhancement Program does not normally permit funds to be used for entertainment costs, with the exception of meals for consultants or other professionals brought to the State as part of a funded project. Only under exceptional circumstances and with compelling justification may Support Fund monies be used for receptions, group meals for faculty and students, refreshments, performers, and other entertainment. All meal charges must comply with State rates as set forth by the Louisiana State Travel Office.

Support may not be requested for shortfalls or deficits in budgets, scholarships or tuition, augmentation of salaries of individuals pursuing regularly assigned duties, or unspecified contingencies; and finally, funds may not be requested for anticipated centers or institutes which require Board approval prior to their establishment and which have not been approved prior to submission of the proposal.

Discounts received for equipment purchases may not be counted as part of the institutional match.

**NOTE ON MEMBERSHIP DUES:** Only under exceptional circumstances may Support Fund dollars be used to support institutional memberships to business, technical, and/or professional organizations. Individual faculty memberships to any of the above are disallowed.

**G. FUNDS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL:**

**Except in compelling and unusual circumstances, BoRSF support may not be requested for faculty or staff support.** If the Project Director feels strongly that such an expenditure is warranted, partial salary support may be requested as release time in proportion to the amount of time each affected employee is expected to contribute to the project, and may not exceed 25% of academic-year salary plus two months of summer support. Support may be provided only as release time or summer salary and in no event may charges to the Support Fund exceed the percentage share of base salary pledged to the project. Faculty and staff may not receive stipends, overload pay or additional compensation for work performed outside of regular duties or work hours, and may not be paid on a contract basis as consultants to a funded project.

If salary support of any kind is requested, the applicant must certify that: (a) Support Fund monies will not supplant State funds; and (b) full-time faculty and staff will not, under any circumstances, receive in excess of 100% of their regular salaries. In addition, the budget justification must provide detailed explanations of the type of salary requested, regular salary level and percentage of effort committed for each individual requesting salary support. Institutions are permitted to provide both salary support and additional compensation in the form of an in-cash or in-kind match.

While requests may be made to fund a full- or part-time faculty or staff position (for a maximum of two years), such requests require substantial justification and a firm commitment from the submitting institution to continue the position after the award period ends.

**H. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Provide information necessary for reviewers to evaluate the capabilities and experience of key personnel. The Biographical Sketch form must be completed for the Project Director and all senior personnel. With respect to publications, biographical sketches should only include relevant books, peer-reviewed publications, and manuscripts formally accepted for publication. Works in progress and/or submitted for publication should not be included.

**I. CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT:** Complete the Support Fund form for the Project Director and all Co-directors. This form is not required for technicians and visiting scholars.

**J. PROJECT ACTIVATION DATE AND ANTICIPATED DATE OF COMPLETION:**

The project activation date is June 1, 2012 and the termination date is June 30, 2013 for one-year projects or June 30, 2014 for two-year projects. No-cost extensions may be requested to complete project activities per Louisiana R.S. 1514. This statute specifies that contracts or amendments to existing contracts issued to institutions of higher education under the authority of the Board of Regents to award grants for educational purposes with funds available from the Louisiana Quality Education Support Fund, the Louisiana Fund, and the Health Excellence Fund may be entered into for periods of not more than six years. However, such contracts may be extended beyond the six-year limit up to an additional two-year period provided no additional costs are incurred.

Extensions to Enhancement awards are limited to a maximum of two (2) years.

# **APPENDIX A**

## **TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES FOR THE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM**

## APPENDIX A

### TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES USED IN THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND PROGRAMS

#### NATURAL SCIENCES - BIOLOGICAL

##### Agriculture

- 0101 Agricultural Economics
- 0102 Agricultural Production
- 0103 Agricultural Sciences
- 0104 Agronomy
- 0105 Animal Sciences
- 0106 Fishery Sciences
- 0107 Food Sciences
- 0108 Forestry and Related Sciences
- 0109 Horticulture
- 0110 Resource Management
- 0111 Parks and Recreation Management
- 0112 Plant Sciences  
(Except Agronomy, see 0104)
- 0113 Renewable Natural Resources
- 0114 Soil Sciences
- 0115 Wildlife Management
- 0199 Agriculture - Other

##### Biological Sciences

- 0201 Anatomy
- 0202 Biochemistry/Biophysics
- 0203 Biology
- 0204 Biometry
- 0205 Botany
- 0206 Cell and Molecular Biology
- 0207 Ecology
- 0208 Embryology
- 0209 Entomology and Parasitology
- 0210 Genetics
- 0211 Marine Biology
- 0212 Microbiology
- 0213 Neurosciences
- 0214 Nutrition
- 0215 Pathology
- 0216 Pharmacology
- 0217 Physiology
- 0218 Radiobiology
- 0219 Toxicology
- 0220 Zoology
- 0299 Biological Sciences - Other

#### NATURAL SCIENCES -BIOLOGICAL (CONTINUED)

##### Health and Medical Sciences

- 0601 Allied Health
- 0602 Audiology and Speech Pathology
- 0603 Chiropractic
- 0604 Dental Sciences
- 0605 Environmental Health
- 0606 Epidemiology
- 0607 Health Science Administration
- 0608 Immunology
- 0609 Medical Sciences
- 0610 Nursing
- 0611 Optometry
- 0612 Osteopathic Medicine
- 0613 Pharmaceutical Sciences
- 0614 Podiatry
- 0615 Pre-Medicine
- 0616 Public Health
- 0617 Veterinary Science
- 0699 Health and Medical Sciences - Other

#### NATURAL SCIENCES - PHYSICAL

##### Chemistry

- 0301 Chemistry, General
- 0302 Analytical Chemistry
- 0303 Inorganic Chemistry
- 0304 Organic Chemistry
- 0305 Pharmaceutical Chemistry
- 0306 Physical Chemistry
- 0399 Chemistry - Other

##### Physics and Astronomy

- 0801 Astronomy
- 0802 Astrophysics
- 0803 Atomic/Molecular Physics
- 0804 Nuclear Physics
- 0805 Optics
- 0806 Planetary Science
- 0807 Solid State Physics
- 0899 Physics and Astronomy - Other

## NATURAL SCIENCES - COMPUTATIONAL

### Computer and Information Sciences

- 0401 Computer Programming
- 0402 Computer Sciences
- 0403 Data Processing
- 0404 Information Sciences
- 0405 Microcomputer Applications
- 0406 Systems Analysis
- 0499 Computer Sciences - Other

### Mathematical Sciences

- 0701 Actuarial Sciences
- 0702 Applied Mathematics
- 0703 Mathematics
- 0704 Probability and Statistics
- 0799 Mathematical Sciences - Other

## NATURAL SCIENCES - EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL

### Earth, Atmospheric, and Marine Sciences

- 0501 Atmospheric Sciences
- 0502 Environmental Sciences
- 0503 Geochemistry
- 0504 Geology
- 0505 Geophysics and Seismology
- 0506 Paleontology
- 0507 Meteorology
- 0508 Oceanography
- 0599 Earth, Atmospheric, and  
Marine Sciences - Other
- 4403 Environmental Design
- 4405 Landscape Architecture

## ENGINEERING - A

### Engineering - Chemical

- 1001 Chemical Engineering
- 1002 Pulp and Paper Production
- 1003 Wood Science
- 1099 Chemical Engineering - Other

### Engineering - Civil

- 1101 Architectural Engineering
- 1102 Civil Engineering
- 1103 Environmental/Sanitary Engr.
- 1199 Civil Engineering - Other

## ENGINEERING - A (CONTINUED)

### Engineering - Electrical and Electronics

- 1201 Computer Engineering
- 1202 Communications Engineering
- 1203 Electrical Engineering
- 1204 Electronics Engineering
- 1299 Electrical and Electronics  
Engineering - Other

## ENGINEERING - B

### Engineering - Industrial

- 1301 Industrial Engineering
- 1302 Operations Research
- 1399 Industrial Engineering - Other

### Engineering - Materials

- 1401 Ceramic Engineering
- 1402 Materials Engineering
- 1403 Materials Science
- 1404 Metallurgical Engineering
- 1499 Materials Engineering - Other

### Engineering - Mechanical

- 1501 Engineering Mechanics
- 1502 Mechanical Engineering
- 1599 Mechanical Engineering - Other

### Engineering - Other

- 1601 Aerospace Engineering
- 1602 Agricultural Engineering
- 1603 Biomedical Engineering
- 1604 Engineering Physics
- 1605 Engineering Science
- 1606 Geological Engineering
- 1607 Mining Engineering
- 1608 Naval Architecture and  
Marine Engineering
- 1609 Nuclear Engineering
- 1610 Ocean Engineering
- 1611 Petroleum Engineering
- 1612 Systems Engineering
- 1613 Textile Engineering
- 1699 Engineering - Other

## SOCIAL SCIENCES

### Anthropology and Archaeology

- 1701 Anthropology
- 1702 Archaeology

### Economics

- 1801 Economics
- 1802 Econometrics

### Law (5102)

### Political Science

- 1901 International Relations
- 1902 Political Science and Government
- 1903 Public Policy Studies
- 1999 Political Science - Other

### Psychology

- 2001 Clinical Psychology
- 2002 Cognitive Psychology
- 2003 Community Psychology
- 2004 Comparative Psychology
- 2005 Counseling Psychology
- 2006 Developmental Psychology
- 2007 Experimental Psychology
- 2008 Industrial and Organizational Psychology
- 2009 Personality Psychology
- 2010 Physiological Psychology
- 2011 Psycholinguistics
- 2012 Psychometrics
- 2013 Psychopharmacology
- 2014 Quantitative Psychology
- 2015 Social Psychology
- 2099 Psychology - Other

### Sociology and Social Work

- 2101 Demography
- 2102 Sociology
- 5001 Social Work

### Social Sciences - Other

- 2201 Area Studies
- 2202 Criminal Justice/Criminology
- 2203 Geography
- 2204 Public Affairs and 4801 Public Administration
- 2205 Urban Studies and 4406 Urban Design
- 2299 Social Sciences - Other
- 4401 Architecture
- 4402 City and Regional Planning
- 4404 Interior Design
- 5101 Interdisciplinary Programs

## SOCIAL SCIENCES (CONTINUED)

### Communications

- 4501 Advertising
- 4502 Communications Research
- 4503 Journalism and Mass Communication
- 4504 Public Relations
- 4505 Radio, TV and Film
- 4506 Speech Communication
- 4599 Communications - Other

### Home Economics

- 4601 Consumer Economics
- 4602 Family Relations
- 4699 Home Economics - Other

### Library and Archival Sciences

- 4701 Library Science
- 4702 Archival Science

## ARTS

### Arts - History, Theory, and Criticism

- 2301 Art History and Criticism
- 2302 Music History, Musicology, and Theory
- 2399 Arts - History, Theory, and Criticism - Other

### Arts - Performance and Studio

- 2401 Art
- 2402 Dance
- 2403 Drama/Theatre Arts
- 2404 Music
- 2405 Design
- 2406 Fine Arts
- 2499 Arts - Performance and Studio - Other

### Arts - Other

- 2999A Arts - Other
- 5101A Interdisciplinary Programs

## HUMANITIES

### English Language and Literature

- 2501 English Language and Literature
- 2502 American Language and Literature
- 2503 Creative Writing
- 2599 English Language and Literature - Other

## HUMANITIES (CONTINUED)

### Foreign Language and Literature

- 2601 Asiatic Languages
- 2602 Foreign Literature
- 2603 French
- 2604 Germanic Languages
- 2605 Italian
- 2606 Russian
- 2607 Semitic Languages
- 2608 Spanish
- 2699 Foreign Languages - Other

### History

- 2701 American History
- 2702 European History
- 2703 History of Science
- 2799 History - Other

### Philosophy

- 2801 All Philosophy Fields

### Humanities - Other

- 2901 Classics
- 2902 Comparative Language and Literature
- 2903 Linguistics
- 2904 Religious Studies; 4901 Religion; and 4902 Theology
- 2999H Humanities - Other
- 5101H Interdisciplinary Programs

## EDUCATION

### Education - Administration

- 3001 Educational Administration
- 3002 Educational Supervision

### Education - Curriculum and Instruction

- 3101 Curriculum and Instruction

### Education - Early Childhood

- 3201 Early Childhood Education

### Education - Elementary

- 3301 Elementary Education
- 3302 Elementary-level Teaching Fields

## EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

### Education-Evaluation and Research

- 3401 Educational Statistics and Research
  
- 3402 Educational Testing Evaluation and Measurement
- 3403 Educational Psychology
- 3404 Elementary and Secondary Research
  
- 3405 Higher Education Research

### Education - Higher

- 3501 Educational Policy
- 3502 Higher Education

### Education - Secondary

- 3601 Secondary Education
- 3602 Secondary Level Teaching Fields

### Education - Special

- 3701 Education of the Gifted
- 3702 Education of the Handicapped
- 3703 Education of Special Learning Disabilities
- 3704 Remedial Education
- 3799 Other Special Education Fields

### Education - Student Counseling & Personnel Services

- 3801 Personnel Services
- 3802 Student Counseling

### Education - Other

- 3901 Adult and Continuing Education
- 3902 Bilingual/Crosscultural Education
- 3903 Educational Media
- 3904 Junior High/Middle School Education
- 3905 Pre-Elementary Education
- 3906 Social Foundations
- 3907 Teaching English as a Second Language/Foreign Language
- 3999 Other Education Fields

## BUSINESS

### Accounting

- 4001 Accounting
- 4002 Taxation

### Banking and Finance

- 4101 Commercial Banking
- 4102 Finance
- 4103 Investments and Securities

### Business, Administration and Management

- 4201 Business Administration and Management
- 4202 Human Resource Development
- 4203 Institutional Management
- 4204 Labor/Industrial Relations
- 4205 Management Science
- 4206 Organizational Behavior
- 4207 Personnel Management
- 4299 Business Management - Other

### Business - Other

- 4301 Business Economics
- 4302 International Business Management
- 4303 Management Information Systems
- 4304 Marketing and Distribution
- 4305 Marketing Management and Research
- 4399 Business Fields - Other

(2011)

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS**

#### **Form 6.11**

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals  
Primarily Requesting Equipment

#### **Form 6.12**

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

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011-12**  
**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 56 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 18 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 6 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?



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: \_\_\_\_\_

(Form 6.11, rev 2011)

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2011-12  
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 66 points**

- |                  |     |   |
|------------------|-----|---|
| _____ of 5 pts.  | B.1 | Are the goals and objectives clearly stated?  |
| _____ of 23 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 6 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?   |

**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. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES\_\_ NO\_\_            E.1        If the Project Director or Co-Project Director has received previous Support Fund support, has it been adequately documented?

COMMENTS:

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

\_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_

**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: \_\_\_\_\_