

**REPORT TO THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF REGENTS  
REVIEW OF ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS IN BUSINESS**

**February 23, 2011**

**Prepared by:**

**Ernest R. Moser (Chair)**  
University of Tennessee at Martin

**Alan E. Ellstrand**  
University of Arkansas

## **2010-11 BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT COMPONENT**

### **Business**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

A review panel consisting of the chair, Dr. Ernest R. Moser, Dean, College of Business and Public Affairs, University of Tennessee at Martin; and Dr. Alan E. Ellstrand, University of Arkansas, met via phone conference on February 21, 2011 for the purpose of evaluating eleven (11) proposals submitted under the business discipline to the Louisiana Board of Regents through the Traditional Enhancement Component of the Board of Regents Support Fund.

The review panel received the following materials prior to the visit: a) eleven (11) business proposals to be evaluated, with appropriately numbered rating forms; b) a summary of proposals listing titles, investigators involved, institutions, dollars requested, etc.; c) the FY 2010-11 Enhancement Program Request for Proposals; and d) the 2007-08 Traditional Enhancement Report in Business.

Prior to the review, each panelist independently evaluated and annotated each of the eleven proposals. During the review process, each proposal was fully discussed by the two reviewers. In each case unanimous agreement was reached, and 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. Due to fiscal exigencies and the need to fund only those projects assured of success, the panel did not recommend funding for any projects with scores lower than 81. A summary of all proposals submitted (Appendix A) and a copy of the rating forms used in the evaluations (Appendix B) are attached at the end of the report.

For each proposal in Table I, only partial awards were recommended because of budgetary limitations or reviewer recommendations; however, the partial funding was determined by a detailed review of each budget which resulted in a funded amount corresponding to the most pressing need(s) presented. First-year requests totaling \$1,127,243 were submitted to the panel, which then recommended first-year awards totaling \$333,900 for seven (7) proposals. Additional, higher amounts of partial funding for the top three ranked proposals were recommended if additional monies become available, to be awarded in rank order.

## Traditional Enhancement Business

**Table I  
Highly Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
1	92	08BUS-11	Tulane	\$105,000	\$55,000		
2	91	01BUS-11	LSU-BR	\$224,105	\$88,000		
3	90	09BUS-11	UL-L	\$150,870	\$60,000		
4	89	07BUS-11	Nicholls	\$80,807	\$29,390		
5	87	11BUS-11	UNO	\$149,936	\$50,000		
6	82	05BUS-11	Nicholls	\$35,130	\$21,580		
7	81	03BUS-11	LaTech	\$108,000	\$29,930		
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$853,848</b>	<b>\$333,900</b>		

**Table II  
Not Recommended for Funding**

Rank	Rating	Number	Institution	1st Year Funds Requested	1st Year Funds Recommended	2nd Year Funds Requested	2nd Year Funds Recommended
8	80	02BUS-11	LSU-BR	\$13,000	\$0		
9	79	04BUS-11	McNeese	\$35,528	\$0	\$19,500	\$0
10	77	06BUS-11	Nicholls	\$97,648	\$0		
11	75	10BUS-11	UL-L	\$127,219	\$0		
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$273,395</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$19,500</b>	<b>\$0</b>

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 01BUS-11

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

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** Louisiana State University College of Business Faculty/Ph.D.  
Research Lab

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Danny Weathers

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.2   5   (of 5 points)  
 A.3   5   (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

E.1   2   (of 2 points)  
 E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 E.2b   8   (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1   5   (of 5 points)  
 B.2  17   (of 18 points)  
 B.3  19   (of 20 points)  
 B.4   4   (of 5 points)  
 B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
 B.6   4   (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1  10   (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   X  

**G. Total Score:** 91 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount:  \$224,105   
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount:  \$88,000 

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

The proposal requests funding for a behavioral research lab in the new Business Education Complex. The panel is very supportive of this proposal. A behavioral research lab will have significant benefits to doctoral students and faculty engaged in empirical research projects. This type of research activity will ultimately elevate the reputation of LSU-Baton Rouge. The proposal was very well written and made a compelling case for the value of the behavioral lab. The panel was especially impressed with the enhancement plan and the detailed budget justification. This is quite a complex proposal, yet the elements of the budget were clearly identified and evaluated. The level of faculty and staff expertise on the team was also quite impressive. In addition, we appreciate the level of institutional support provided to complement grant funds. Budgetary constraints will not permit fully funding this proposal, and the panel feels that the lab could be still be very effective at a scaled-down size. Funding in the amount of \$88,000 is recommended to be allocated at the discretion of the PI. Should additional funding become available the panel recommends that an additional \$12,000 be allocated in support of this project. The institutional match may be proportionately reduced.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 02BUS-11

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

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: ISDS is STEM: LSU Professor Proposes the Teaching of Information Systems & Decision Sciences (ISDS) at the High School Level in Louisiana to Improve STEM Education and the Louisiana Economy

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Sonja Wiley-Patton

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2     4     (of 5 points)  
A.3     4     (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    16    (of 23 points)  
B.3    19    (of 25 points)  
B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
B.6     6     (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

C.1     7     (of 12 points)

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

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

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   X  

F. Total Score: 80 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY REQUESTED AMOUNT:     \$13,000      
RECOMMENDATIONS: RECOMMENDED AMOUNT:         \$0        

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

The proposal seeks funding to provide science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) training to high school teachers in Louisiana. Teachers will receive instruction on how to teach a principles-level Information Systems class (ISDS 1100) to Louisiana high school students. These students will receive concurrent high school and college credit for the course. The amounts requested will primarily cover stipends provided to high school teachers who attend the training. The panel believes that disseminating information on teaching STEM education is valuable and will have a long-term economic benefit to Louisiana. The panel also found the proposal to be well written and of sufficient detail to convey the key elements of the program. However, by law Board of Regents Support Fund monies must only be expended for higher education purposes and, therefore, cannot be used to fund stipends for K-12 teachers. As a result, the panel does not recommend that this proposal be funded.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

**PROPOSAL NUMBER:** 03BUS-11

**INSTITUTION:** Louisiana Tech University

**TITLE OF PROPOSAL:** College of Business Virtual Laboratory

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Tom Roberts

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2   5   (of 5 points)  
A.3   5   (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

E.1   2   (of 2 points)  
E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b   8   (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1   5   (of 5 points)  
B.2  11   (of 18 points)  
B.3  16   (of 20 points)  
B.4   3   (of 5 points)  
B.5   2   (of 2 points)  
B.6   4   (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

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

D.1  12   (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   X  

**G. Total Score:** 81 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY**      **Requested Amount:**   \$108,000    
**RECOMMENDATIONS:**    **Recommended Amount:**   \$29,930  

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

The proposal requests funding for a virtual computer laboratory that will expand computing capabilities to off-campus and distance education students. This program would enable off-campus students to have access to specialized software that, to date, has only been available to students through on-campus computer lab facilities. The panel believes that the goal of the proposal is worthy. This will enable the institution to increase its offering of distance education classes and help to recruit additional students. The proposal was generally well written and the budget was clear and detailed. However, the proposal lacks a clear work plan timeline and it does not make a compelling case for how the project would lead the department to regional, national or international eminence. The panel believes that the greatest benefit associated with the proposal is extending computing capabilities to students off campus. Therefore, the panel recommends funding of \$29,930 to support purchase of two servers and related software but does not recommend funding for the purchase of laptops for student check-out. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately, in accordance with the panel's stipulations.

## RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 04BUS-11

INSTITUTION: McNeese State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Improving Student Learning Through an External Experience

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Mitchell Adrian

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.2     4     (of 5 points)  
 A.3     4     (of 5 points)

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1    10    (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1     2     (of 2 points)  
 D.2a            (For S/E)  
 or  
 D.2b     8     (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 66 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    18    (of 23 points)  
 B.3    19    (of 25 points)  
 B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     4     (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

F. Total Score: 79 (of 100 points)

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

		YEAR 1	YEAR 2
<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>\$35,528</u>	<u>\$19,500</u>
	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

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

The proposal seeks funding to support a program that would require business students to engage in an external experience such as an internship, a study abroad or service learning. The funds requested would purchase a high-end printer to print promotional materials and provide scholarships to help support student participation in program activities. While the panel believes that external experiences can be valuable in enhancing student education, the proposal fell short in several areas. It did not provide a detailed work plan and did not make a strong case for how the program would achieve eminence at the regional, national or international level. Benefits to faculty development were also not clearly articulated. In addition, the rationale for the high-end printer was not convincing. The panel also had concerns about the sustainability of the program after the first two years of proposed grant funding. As a result, the panel does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 05BUS-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Upgrading and Updating a Mobile Laptop Lab for Business  
Administration Courses

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: R. Morris Coats

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)

B.1		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	
B.2		<u>16</u>	(of 18 points)	
B.3		<u>12</u>	(of 20 points)	
B.4		<u>5</u>	(of 5 points)	
B.5		<u>2</u>	(of 2 points)	
B.6		<u>3</u>	(of 6 points)	
B.7	Yes	<u>X</u>	No	

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

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

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

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

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

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

G. Total Score: 82 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY	Requested Amount:	<u>\$35,130</u>
RECOMMENDATIONS:	Recommended Amount:	<u>\$21,580</u>

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

The proposal seeks funding to replace nearly ten-year-old laptop computers that are used to outfit a mobile laptop lab with new laptops and updated software and peripherals. While the proposal was comprehensive and provided a reasonable rationale in support of the project, it was poorly written in places, including the project rationale and aspects of the enhancement plan. In addition, the material in support of achieving recognized eminence referred to faculty citations and it was not clear how funding the mobile laptop lab would contribute to enhancing faculty research productivity. Nevertheless, the panel believes that the project has merit. The budget was clearly stated and equipment requested was well supported. The panel recommends the purchase of 20 laptops to replace the oldest machines currently in use in the mobile lab as well as a small budget for software and peripherals to support the new laptops. As a result, the panel suggests partial funding in the amount of \$21,580 for this project. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 06BUS-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Enhancement of Assessment, Accreditation, and Teaching Effectiveness

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Shari Lawrence

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 62 Points)

B.1	<u>  5  </u>	(of 5 points)		
B.2	<u> 18 </u>	(of 23 points)		
B.3	<u> 17 </u>	(of 25 points)		
B.4	<u>  4  </u>	(of 5 points)		
B.5	<u>  2  </u>	(of 2 points)		
B.6	<u>  5  </u>	(of 6 points)		
B.7	Yes	<u>  X  </u>	No	<u>          </u>

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

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

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

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

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)

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

F. Total Score: 77 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$97,648  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>      \$0      </u>

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

The proposal seeks support for funding of administrator and faculty travel to training seminars offered by the Association for the Advancement of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) in order to enhance the College's ability to maintain accreditation. The proposal is well written and provides a detailed work plan and timeline for AACSB-sponsored events. The panel was impressed with the credentials of the faculty who prepared the proposal. The panel also agrees that the conferences and seminars sponsored by the AACSB are valuable. However, the panel is not convinced that such travel will be the best use of available grant funds. In addition, the College was recently re-accredited by AACSB so there is no pressing need to address accreditation issues at this time. The College can send a few key administrators to selected meetings and have those attending report back to benefit others. Thus, the panel is not persuaded that the outcomes associated with this proposal are significant and, as a result, does not recommend funding for this proposal.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 07BUS-11

INSTITUTION: Nicholls State University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: The Sales and Interactive Training Lab Upgrade

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Rene Viosca

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.2     5     (of 5 points)  
 A.3     5     (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**

(Total of 10 Points)

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

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

(Total of 12 Points)

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

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 56 Points)

B.1     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.2    16    (of 18 points)  
 B.3    18    (of 20 points)  
 B.4     4     (of 5 points)  
 B.5     1     (of 2 points)  
 B.6     4     (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**G. Total Score:** 89 (of 100 points)

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

<b>SPECIFIC BUDGETARY</b>	<b>Requested Amount:</b>	<u>  \$80,807  </u>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS:</b>	<b>Recommended Amount:</b>	<u>  \$29,390  </u>

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

Overall, this is a good, if ambitious, proposal which requests funds to modernize and enhance an existing sales and interactive training room. The room has been successfully utilized over the past nine years but needs its original equipment replaced. The proposal is well written, but could have garnered additional points if more specific applications had been included rather than, for example, vague references to "other behaviorally-oriented courses" and additional instructors who may use the facility. Data, such as the number of students who use the facility each semester, the number of classes involved and testimonials from students who have benefited (received a job offer) and employers who have hired graduates of the program would have been helpful to the panel. The reviewers praise the detailed list of equipment needed, prices, etc. The budget was clearly well thought out and articulated, though the project could still be very effective if scaled back. Due to limited funds available, the panel recommends partial funding of \$29,390 for improving the existing facility with funds to be allocated at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 08BUS-11

INSTITUTION: Tulane University

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Energy Market Education Realism Enhancement Project

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Geoffrey Parker

**A. The Current Situation**

(Total of 10 Points)

A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_  
 A.2 5 (of 5 points)  
 A.3 5 (of 5 points)

**C. Faculty and Staff Expertise**

(Total of 12 Points)

C.1 11 (of 12 points)

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

(Total of 12 Points)

D.1 2 (of 2 points)  
 D.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
 or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
 D.2b 8 (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**

(Total of 62 Points)

B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.2 20 (of 23 points)  
 B.3 25 (of 25 points)  
 B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
 B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
 B.6 4 (of 6 points)  
 B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Previous Support Fund Awards**

(No Points Assigned)

F.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

F. Total Score: 92 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$105,000  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$55,000

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

The goal of this proposal is to enhance an existing energy market education facility that is unique in Louisiana and the United States. The enhanced and more realistic "trading room" will complement the new master's program in energy as well as the existing certificate programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The proposal is well written and well documented, and highlights the limitations of the existing simulations very well. While the existing simulations were developed in house, the expansion of the realism of the simulations will require programming capabilities beyond those of the Institute's faculty and staff, as well as additional servers. Budget limitations preclude full funding of this outstanding proposal and the reviewers recommend partial funding of \$55,000 to be allocated at the discretion of the PI. Should additional funding become available, the panel recommends increasing the award to \$65,000 total. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 09BUS-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Development of an Interactive Sales and Negotiation Training  
Laboratory to Facilitate Learning and Curricula Enhancement

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Gwen Fontenot

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2     5     (of 5 points)  
A.3     5     (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
C.1     6     (of 6 points)  
C.2     1     (of 1 point)  
C.3     2     (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural  
Development and Impact**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
E.1     2     (of 2 points)  
E.2a            (For S/E)  
or            (of 10 points)  
E.2b    10    (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)  
B.1     5     (of 5 points)  
B.2    16    (of 18 points)  
B.3    17    (of 20 points)  
B.4     5     (of 5 points)  
B.5     2     (of 2 points)  
B.6     4     (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
D.1    10    (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)  
G.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

G. Total Score: 90 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:    \$150,870     
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:    \$60,000   

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

This ambitious proposal seeks funds to convert an existing classroom into an interactive sales and negotiation training laboratory (to include a conference room, classroom, and three role-play/interview rooms) as well as convert two existing auditoriums into additional role-play rooms. The panel believes the project will enhance the educational experience for students throughout the College of Commerce. Further, the panel appreciates the detail with which the budget was constructed and divided. This is clearly a well-thought-out plan that even includes sketches of the proposed facility. There is no institutional match. While budget limitations preclude full funding, the panel recommends partial funding of \$60,000 to be allocated at the discretion of the principal investigator. If additional funding becomes available, the panel recommends allocating a total of \$65,000.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 10BUS-11

INSTITUTION: University of Louisiana at Lafayette

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Transition to ICD-10-CM/PCS Coding and Reimbursement System

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Anita Hazelwood

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
A.1 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2   4   (of 5 points)  
A.3   4   (of 5 points)

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
C.1   5   (of 6 points)  
C.2   1   (of 1 point)  
C.3   2   (of 3 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural  
Development and Impact**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
E.1   2   (of 2 points)  
E.2a \_\_\_\_\_ (For S/E)  
or \_\_\_\_\_ (of 10 points)  
E.2b   6   (For NS/NE)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)  
B.1   3   (of 5 points)  
B.2  16   (of 18 points)  
B.3  15   (of 20 points)  
B.4   3   (of 5 points)  
B.5   1   (of 2 points)  
B.6   4   (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes   X   No \_\_\_\_\_

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
D.1   9   (of 12 points)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)  
G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No   X  

G. Total Score: 75 (of 100 points)

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

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY Requested Amount:   \$127,219    
RECOMMENDATIONS: Recommended Amount:       \$0      

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

The proposal seeks funds to upgrade health information management laboratories at two universities to teach students how to code under the new coding methodology required of hospitals. The panel believes it is not a business proposal and should not be eligible in this competition. It has only a peripheral relationship to a business program through an MBA concentration at UL-L. In addition, the proposal lost a considerable number of points in the areas of evidence to achieve eminence, faculty and staff expertise, and promotion of economic development. The panel recommends that the authors resubmit the proposal when health and medical sciences is eligible. Funding is not recommended.

# RATING FORM FOR ENHANCEMENT INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

PROPOSAL NUMBER: 11BUS-11

INSTITUTION: University of New Orleans

TITLE OF PROPOSAL: Using Technology-Based Active Learning to Enhance Student Success

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Pamela Kennett-Hensel

**A. The Current Situation**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
A.1 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_  
A.2 4 (of 5 points)  
A.3 5 (of 5 points)

**B. The Enhancement Plan**  
(Total of 56 Points)  
B.1 5 (of 5 points)  
B.2 15 (of 18 points)  
B.3 16 (of 20 points)  
B.4 5 (of 5 points)  
B.5 2 (of 2 points)  
B.6 5 (of 6 points)  
B.7 Yes X No \_\_\_\_\_

**C. Equipment**  
(Total of 10 Points)  
C.1 5 (of 6 points)  
C.2 1 (of 1 point)  
C.3 3 (of 3 points)

**D. Faculty and Staff Expertise**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
D.1 10 (of 12 points)

**E. Economic and/or Cultural Development and Impact**  
(Total of 12 Points)  
E.1 2 (of 2 points)  
E.2a 1 (For S/E)  
or (of 10 points)  
E.2b 9 (For NS/NE)

**F. Previous Support Fund Awards**  
(No Points Assigned)  
G.1 Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X

**G. Total Score:** 87 (of 100 points)

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

**SPECIFIC BUDGETARY** Requested Amount: \$149,936  
**RECOMMENDATIONS:** Recommended Amount: \$50,000

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

This very ambitious proposal seeks funds to convert an existing classroom into a 77-seat computer teaching laboratory/classroom. An additional teaching lab in the College of Business Administration will greatly enhance the quality of student learning. The panel is impressed with the detail contained in the budget and its justification, as well as with the author's well-thought-out description of its impact on existing resources. While the proposal is a good one, it could have been enhanced by including more detail in the work plan and in the potential to achieve eminence section. Due to limited funds available, the panel recommends partially funding the proposal at \$50,000 to be allocated at the discretion of the PI. The institutional match may be reduced proportionately.

# **Appendix A**

## **Summary List of Proposals**

Proposals Submitted to the Traditional Enhancement Program - Business  
for the FY 2010-11 Review Cycle

Proposal Number	PI Name	Institution	Duration	Equipment/ Non Equipment	New/Contin uation	Project Title	Amount Requested		
							Year 1	Year 2	Total
001BUS-11	Weathers,Danny	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	E	N	Louisiana State University College of Business Faculty/Ph.D. Research Lab	\$224,105.00	\$0.00	\$224,105.00
002BUS-11	Wiley- Patton,Sonja	Louisiana State University And A&M College - Baton Rouge	1 Year	NE	N	ISDS is STEM: LSU Professor Proposes the Teaching of Information Systems & Decision Sciences (ISDS) at the High School Level in Louisiana to Improve STEM Education and the Louisiana Economy	\$13,000.00	\$0.00	\$13,000.00
003BUS-11	Roberts,Tom	Louisiana Tech University	1 Year	E	N	College of Business Virtual Laboratory	\$108,000.00	\$0.00	\$108,000.00
004BUS-11	Adrian,Mitchell	McNeese State University	2 Years	NE	N	Improving Student Learning Through an External Experience	\$35,528.00	\$19,500.00	\$55,028.00
005BUS-11	Coats,R. Morris	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	N	Upgrading and Updating a Mobile Laptop Lab for Business Administration Courses	\$35,130.00	\$0.00	\$35,130.00
006BUS-11	Lawrence,Shari	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	N	Enhancement of Assessment, Accreditation, and Teaching Effectiveness	\$97,648.00	\$0.00	\$97,648.00
007BUS-11	Viosca,Rene	Nicholls State University	1 Year	E	N	The Sales and Interactive Training Lab Upgrade	\$80,807.00	\$0.00	\$80,807.00
008BUS-11	Parker,Geoffrey	Tulane University	1 Year	NE	N	Energy Market Education Realism Enhancement Project	\$105,000.00	\$0.00	\$105,000.00
009BUS-11	Fontenot,Gwen	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	N	Development of an Interactive Sales and Negotiation Training Laboratory to Facilitate Learning and Curricula Enhancement	\$150,870.00	\$0.00	\$150,870.00
010BUS-11	Hazelwood,Anita	University of Louisiana at Lafayette	1 Year	E	N	Transition to ICD-10-CM/PCS Coding and Reimbursement System	\$127,219.00	\$0.00	\$127,219.00
011BUS-11	Kennett- Hensel,Pamela	University of New Orleans	1 Year	E	N	Using Technology-Based Active Learning to Enhance Student Success	\$149,936.00	\$0.00	\$149,936.00

\* The Enhancement Program RFP restricts requests for 2nd-year funding to no more than \$50,000

Total Number of Proposals submitted	11
Total Money Requested for First Year	\$1,127,243.00
Total Money Requested for Second Year	\$19,500.00
Total Money Requested	\$1,146,743.00

# **Appendix B**

## **Rating Forms**

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

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

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11**  
**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?   |

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. 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:

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

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

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

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2010-11  
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? |
|---------------|-----|---|

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

Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 2 of 3

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\_\_      F.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: \_\_\_\_\_  
Page 3 of 3

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: \_\_\_\_\_