

**REPORT TO THE
LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS**

REVIEW OF BUSINESS ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS

March 7, 2008

Prepared by:

Ernest R. Moser
College of Business and Public Affairs
University of Tennessee at Martin
Panel Chair

Alan E. Ellstrand
Sam M. Walton College of Business
University of Arkansas

2007-08 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT

BUSINESS

INTRODUCTION

A review panel in the Business discipline consisting of Professors Ernest R. Moser, Chair of the panel, University of Tennessee at Martin, and Alan E. Ellstrand, University of Arkansas, met via teleconference on March 7, 2008, for the purpose of evaluating fourteen (14) Business proposals submitted to the Louisiana Board of Regents in the Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) fourteen (14) Business proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered ratings forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; and c) the FY 2007-08 Enhancement Request for Proposals.

Prior to the teleconference, each reviewer independently evaluated and annotated each of the fourteen proposals. These evaluations were then exchanged for extensive comment and review. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached on a proposal's ranking, budget recommendation, and comments. The reviewers ensured that each proposal received a thorough and fair evaluation based on criteria enumerated in the RFP. Table I contains a rank-order list of the proposals highly recommended for funding with recommended funding levels. Proposals not recommended for funding are listed in Table II. A detailed review of each proposal follows immediately after the tables. A summary of all proposals submitted in the Business discipline (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

In some cases, partial awards were recommended. Downward adjustments to funds requested were determined by a detailed review of project budgets, which resulted in recommended funding amounts corresponding to the most pressing documented need(s). First-year requests totaling \$1,288,844 were submitted to the Business review panel. Second-year requests totaled \$155,765. The total amount of first-year funds recommended for expenditure is \$430,726; no second-year funding is recommended.

TABLE I

PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	92	010BUS-08	NICHOLLS	\$71,955	\$71,955		
2	86	004BUS-08	LSU-S	\$119,392	\$119,392		
3	85	005BUS-08	LSU-S	\$119,908	\$78,296		
4	83	007BUS-08	LOYOLA	\$123,244	\$65,000		
5	81	013BUS-08	UL LAFAYETTE	\$66,482	\$58,482	\$51,295*	\$0
6	78	014BUS-08	UL LAFAYETTE	\$47,601	\$37,601		
TOTALS:				\$548,582	\$430,726	\$51,295	\$0

** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

TABLE II

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF FUNDING IS AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
7	77	002BUS-08	LSU-BR	\$89,405	\$50,500		
8	73	009BUS-08	MCNEESE	\$106,361	\$31,339		
9	74	003BUS-08	LSU-E	\$90,560	\$90,560		
TOTALS:				\$286,326	\$172,399	\$0	\$0

** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

TABLE III**PROPOSALS NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING**

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
10	70	008BUS-08	LOYOLA	\$94,270	\$0		
10	70	006BUS-08	LA TECH	\$69,767	\$0		
12	67	012BUS-08	SUNO	\$85,356	\$0		
12	67	001BUS-08	LSU-BR	\$87,073	\$0		
14	53	011BUS-08	SUBR	\$117,470	\$0	\$104,470	\$0
				\$453,936	\$0	\$104,470	\$0

TABLE I

PROPOSALS HIGHLY RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
1	92	010BUS-08	NICHOLLS	\$71,955	\$71,955		
2	86	004BUS-08	LSU-S	\$119,392	\$119,392		
3	85	005BUS-08	LSU-S	\$119,908	\$78,296		
4	83	007BUS-08	LOYOLA	\$123,244	\$65,000		
5	81	013BUS-08	UL LAFAYETTE	\$66,482	\$58,482	\$51,295*	
6	78	014BUS-08	UL LAFAYETTE	\$47,601	\$37,601		
TOTALS:				\$548,582	\$430,726	\$51,295	

** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

TABLE II

PROPOSALS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING IF FUNDING IS AVAILABLE

RANK	RATING	PROPOSAL NO.	INSTITUTION	FIRST YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	FIRST YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS REQUESTED	SECOND YEAR FUNDS RECOMMENDED
7	77	002BUS-08	LSU-BR	\$89,405	\$50,500		
8	73	009BUS-08	MCNEESE	\$106,361	\$31,339		
9	74	003BUS-08	LSU-E	\$90,560	\$90,560		
TOTALS:				\$286,326	\$172,399	\$0	

** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

**Proposals Submitted to the
Traditional Enhancement Program - Business
for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
001BUS-08 BUS	PREDICT Enhancement Plan: Partnering for the Future	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Economics);	Dek Terrell; Helmut Schneider;	1	\$ 87,073
				Total	\$ 87,073

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

002BUS-08 BUS	Converting Research to Results: An Entrepreneurship and Innovation Colloquium Series	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge (Stephenson Entrepreneurship Institute);	K. Mark Weaver; Charles F. D'Agostino;	1	\$ 89,405
				Total	\$ 89,405

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

E=Primarily an Equipment Request

N=Not Primarily an Equipment Request

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
003BUS-08 BUS	The Economic Gardening Activity Theory Usable Laboratory (ATUL)	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Eunice (Business and Technology);	Fred Neal Landry; Jan Broussard; Michael Axelrod; Sanford Wood; Steven Gervais;	1	\$ 90,560
				Total	\$ 90,560

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

004BUS-08 BUS	Teaching and Learning Digital Communications	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Management/Marketing);	Janice Goode; Del Johnson; Tim Shaughnessy;	1	\$ 119,392
				Total	\$ 119,392

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

005BUS-08 BUS	Engaging Students, Enhancing Active Learning and Developing Faculty Via Technology	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Shreveport (Management/Marketing);	Karen E. James; Douglas Bible; John Fortenberry; Ray Taylor;	1	\$ 119,908
				Total	\$ 119,908

E

Proposal is a **New Request**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
--------------	--------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

006BUS-08 BUS	Information Assurance Mobile Laboratories	Louisiana Tech University (Management and Information Systems);	Tom L. Roberts; James J. Cochran; Selwyn Ellis;	1	\$ 69,767
				Total	\$ 69,767

EProposal is a **New Request**

007BUS-08 BUS	Video Conferencing Equipment for College of Business Music Industry Studies Professional Education at Loyola University	Loyola University New Orleans (Business Administration);	Jerry R. Goolsby;	1	\$ 123,244
				Total	\$ 123,244

EProposal is a **New Request**

008BUS-08 BUS	Improving Louisiana's Business Education Outcome: An Investigation of the Use of the Modified Problem Based Learning Approach to Business Education	Loyola University New Orleans (Business);	Lee Yao; Wing Fok;	1	\$ 94,270
				Total	\$ 94,270

NProposal is a **New Request**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
009BUS-08 BUS	Enhancement of Teaching Skills and Assessment/Accreditation Knowledge: A	McNeese State University (Business);	Mitchell Adrian;	1	\$ 106,361
N	Comprehensive Faculty Development Plan for the College of Business at McNeese State University			Total	\$ 106,361
Proposal is a New Request					
010BUS-08 BUS	Enhanced Learning Environments Using Flexible Learning Technologies in Support of a Master Plan in the College of Business Administration at Nicholls State University: Phase III	Nicholls State University (Management and Marketing);	R. Charles Viosca, Jr.; Betty Kleen; Bruce McManis; Kevin Cruthirds; R. Morris Coats; Shari Lawrence; Sherry Rodrigue; Sonya Premeaux;	1	\$ 71,955
E				Total	\$ 71,955
Proposal is a New Request					
011BUS-08 BUS	Enhancement of Basic Economics and Financial Fundamentals in Secondary Education	Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge (Economics and Finance);	Leroy Davis; Katina T. L. January; Milton H. Kleinpeter;	1 2	\$ 117,470 \$ 104,470*
N				Total	\$ 221,940
Proposal is a New Request					

*** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.**

Prop#	Title	Institution/Department	Principal Investigator(s)	Duration (Years)	BoRSF Money Requested
012BUS-08 BUS	Enterprise Adventures in Business	Southern University and A&M College at New Orleans (Business);	Louis Mancuso; Shatiqua Mosby-Wilson;	1	\$ 85,356
				Total	\$ 85,356

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

013BUS-08 BUS	Development of a Property Management System (PMS) Software Simulation and Lab for the Hospitality Management Program in the B. I. Moody III College of Business Administration	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Marketing and Hospitality);	Gina Fe G. Causin; Becky Dubois; Gwen Fontenot;	1 2	\$ 66,482 \$ 51,295*
				Total	\$ 117,777

N

Proposal is a **New Request**

014BUS-08 BUS	Enhancement of the Undergraduate Hospitality Management Program Through Accreditation, Improved Technology & Lab Facility Upgrades	University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Marketing and Hospitality);	Gwen Fontenot; Becky Gaspard Dubois; Gina Causin;	1	\$ 47,601
E				Total	\$ 47,601

Proposal is a **New Request**

*** Note: The RFP restricts requests for 2nd year funding to \$50,000.**

Summary of Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Business for the FY 2007-2008 Review Cycle			
Total Number of Proposals Submitted	Total First-Year Funds Requested	Total Funds Requested	Total First-Year Funds Available
14	\$ 1,288,844	\$ 1,444,609	\$

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 2007-08

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 2007-08
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:

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

_____ of 12 pts

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 2 pts.

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

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

_____ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES__ NO__

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

COMMENTS:

G. 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: _____