

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2015-16

Request for Proposals, Number 2015-08

Guidelines for Submission

**Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS)
and
Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund)**

(This RFP excludes the R&D Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars [ATLAS] Subprogram, and the R&D Industrial Ties Research Subprogram [ITRS] with Proof-of-Concept/Prototype (P-o-C/P) Initiative. The ATLAS RFP is Number 2015-10, ITRS with Proof-of-Concept/Prototype Initiative RFP is Number 2015-12)

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<https://web.laregents.org>

(Revised 7-2015)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, NUMBER 2015-08

Important Notices

Electronic Submission of Notices of Intent and Proposals

RCS and Pfund proposals will be submitted through the Louisiana Online Grant Automation Network (LOGAN). The instructions for submitting notices of intent and proposals electronically are available at <https://web.laregents.org/support>. For help with electronic submission, please email support@laregents.org.

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 15, 2015, or until 4:30 p.m. of the first working day following this date. To ensure that all interested parties receive the same information no inquiry will be accepted--whether written or oral--after that date.

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 15, 2015 to be considered prior to the issuance of the next RFP.

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.

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 while minimizing the number of paper copies that institutions must produce, this RFP is available on the Internet: <https://web.laregents.org> under Downloads -"RFPs, Policies and Forms."

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. R & D Program Administrator; Questions About This RFP	1
II. Types of R & D Subprograms	1
III. The Research Competitiveness Subprogram with Pilot Funding for New Research Component	2
A. Objectives	2
B. Eligibility Considerations and Requirements	2
1. Eligible Faculty	2
2. Eligible Institutions	3
3. Eligible Activities	3
4. Eligible Disciplines	3
C. Monetary Limitations	4
D. Project Duration	4
E. Funds Available	4
F. Cost Sharing, Matching Commitments, and Indirect Cost Rate	4
G. Institutional Screening Committee	4
H. Assessment of Proposals by Out-of-State Experts	5
1. Mail and Subject-Area Reviews	5
2. Final Panel Evaluation	5
I. Final Selection of Proposals to be Funded	5
J. Debriefing	6
K. Timetable	6
L. Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required	6
M. Previous Submissions	6
IV. Procedure and Deadline for Submission of Notices of Intent & Proposals	6
A. Notices of Intent	6
B. Proposals	7
V. Proposal Requirements and Format	7
A. General Requirements and Stipulations	7
1. Limitation on Number of Research Proposals That May Be Submitted	7
2. Submission Requirements	7
3. General Format Stipulations	7
4. Addenda Submitted Before or After Receipt of Proposal	7
5. Guidelines for Identifying, Labeling and Certifying the Confidential Nature of Information Contained in Research Proposals	8
6. Guidelines for Proposals Involving the Use of Human Subjects or Vertebrate Animal	8
B. Specific Requirements and Format	8
1. Cover Page	8
2. Project Summary	8
3. Goals and Objectives	9
4. Narrative and Bibliography	9
5. Budget and Budget Narrative	10
6. Current and Pending Support/History of Support	12
7. Biographical Sketch	12
8. Proposal Appendix	12
Appendix A: Taxonomy of Disciplines for the R&D Program	
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) stipulation of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of monies 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.

The Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund) component established with BoRSF match through the EPSCoR cooperative agreement between Louisiana and NSF can no longer be continued under the new NSF TRACK 1 anticipated to start FY 2015-16. Funding for Pfund will continue through the BoRSF under the R&D Research Competitiveness Subprogram.

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 for 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:

- i. the carefully defined research efforts at public and private universities in Louisiana;
- ii. the endowment of chairs for eminent scholars;
- iii. the enhancement of the quality of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units within a university; and
- iv. 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 Support Fund policies affirm 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. R & D PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR; QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RFP

Specific questions concerning this RFP and the requirements set forth herein should be directed to Ms. Zenovia Simmons, R & D Program Manager (zenovia.simmons@la.gov) at (225) 342-4253. In compliance with R. S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 15, 2015 (or until 4:30 p.m. of the first working day following this date). As soon as possible after that date, all questions asked about this RFP and answers provided in response to these questions will be posted on the Board of Regents Sponsored Programs website, <https://web.laregents.org>. To ensure that all interested parties receive the same information, no inquiries, whether oral or written, will be accepted after the deadline date.

II. TYPES OF R & D SUBPROGRAMS

The Board of Regents Support Fund R & D Program consists of three subprograms: the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS) with/Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund) component, the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS) with Proof-of-Concept/Prototype (P-o-C/P) Initiative, and the Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Subprogram. Potential applicants should be aware that: (1) the requirements for research proposals vary, depending upon the subprogram or component in which they are submitted; (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals; and (3) ATLAS and ITRS with P-o-C/P Initiative are administered under a separate RFP, available on the Sponsored Programs website. See in-depth evaluation forms

for research proposals in Appendix B for the criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals submitted in the subprogram or component.

III. THE RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS SUBPROGRAM with PILOT FUNDING FOR NEW RESEARCH COMPONENT

A. OBJECTIVES

Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS)

The specific objective of the RCS is to solicit research proposals designed to build and strengthen the fundamental research base and competitiveness of Louisiana's universities. The proposed research must include fundamental (basic) research contributions rather than simply the application of existing knowledge.

The RCS is a stimulus program directed only toward those researchers who are at the threshold of becoming competitive on a consistent basis in the Federal R & D marketplace and who--with some assistance from the Support Fund to implement their plans to overcome whatever barriers they have identified which have stood in their way--clearly have a strong potential for enhancing their competitive status within a limited time span. For this reason, it is unlikely that researchers and/or research groups that are already established and heavily funded (unless they are moving into a new field of research and also fit the above criteria) would be highly competitive. Junior researchers at the threshold of becoming competitive will be given priority over senior researchers who are changing research fields.

Established researchers and/or research groups that are already competitive and heavily funded are strongly encouraged to participate in research proposals submitted to the RCS in an advisory capacity, but they shall not receive funding under this subprogram. Those individuals or groups that have no previous funding records, but who wish to submit a proposal, are strongly encouraged to join with researchers/research groups who do have a history of Federal basic research funding.

Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund)

The objective of the Pfund is to stimulate and support faculty on a limited basis in their exploration of novel science and engineering research leading to federal support. The Pfund provides short-term pilot awards for both tenured and tenure-track faculty.

- **Tenure-track faculty** can use the seed funding made available by this program to sharpen their research focus and develop cutting-edge techniques.
- **Tenured faculty** can use award funds to demonstrate an innovative or novel concept and become more competitive by investigating new areas that require a shift in their current research direction.

The ultimate goal of the Pfund is to enable faculty to submit more competitive federal proposals. Reviewers will evaluate the merit of each proposal based in part on the potential of the investigator to enhance his/her research competitiveness in order to secure federal funds.

B. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. ELIGIBLE FACULTY: Only tenured or tenure-track faculty employed on a full-time basis by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. **An eligible faculty member may serve (see Section V.A.1) as a principal or co-principal investigator on a maximum of one RCS or one Pfund grant at any one time.** Individuals who are not eligible to serve as principal or co-principal investigators (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, co-principal, or other (senior advisory faculty) investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal. Pfund awards are usually single-investigator. While co-PIs are allowable, one and only one individual must be listed on the cover sheet as principal investigator. Individuals who received RCS or Pfund awards in **last year's** competition (i.e., RCS contracts with a start date of 6/1/2015 or Pfund contracts with a start date of 1/1/2015) are **not** eligible for this round of funding. Individuals who received Pfund awards in the FY2013-14 or earlier competitions **are** eligible for this round of funding. Section III.A of this RFP provides more information on the type of researcher(s) targeted in RCS and Pfund.

Principal investigators who are delinquent in submitting contractually required reports for prior or existing Board of Regents Support Fund and/or Federal awards managed by the Board of Regents Sponsored Programs Section are precluded from submitting a RCS or Pfund proposal in response to this RFP until the required report(s) has been received and accepted by the Board.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:** Board policies stipulate that all Louisiana public institutions of higher education and those independent institutions of higher education which are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities are eligible to compete under the Support Fund R & D Program.
3. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:** Both basic and applied research proposals will be considered. Potential applicants should be aware, however, that R & D program funds must be used for research. For example, proposals will not be considered that are designed only to: (1) keep museums and/or laboratories open; (2) add to collections; (3) fund conferences or workshops; (4) purchase instrumentation; (5) provide services; (6) provide money to support ongoing operating costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects; or (7) support literature reviews and/or develop protocols.
4. **ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES:** All Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines on a rotating basis (see Table 1). Note that the topic of the research proposal should be used to determine eligibility, not the academic training of the potential applicants.

TABLE I: ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES*

GROUP I - ELIGIBLE EVERY YEAR

Biological Sciences I (Cell/Molecular Biology, Biochemistry, Microbiology)
Biological Sciences II (Ecology, Nutrition, Natural Biology, Toxicology, Pharmacology, Neurosciences, Anatomy, Genetics [Physiology-Phenotype])
Computer and Information Sciences
Earth/Environmental Sciences

GROUP II - ELIGIBLE IN FYS 2014-15, 2015-16, 2018-19, 2019-20

Agricultural Sciences
Engineering A (Chemical, Civil, Electrical, etc.)
Mathematics
Physics/Astronomy
Social Sciences

GROUP III - ELIGIBLE IN FYS 2012-13, 2013-14, 2016-17, 2017-18

Chemistry
Health and Medical Sciences
Engineering B (Industrial, Materials, Mechanical, etc.)

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

C. MONETARY LIMITATIONS

RCS: No applicant may seek more than a total of \$200,000 over a three-year period. Applicants should be aware, however, that the average first-year RCS award in FY 2014-15 was \$43,275 with first-year awards ranging from \$18,963 to \$68,787. Also, because of the intense proposal pressure in this subprogram, applicants are advised that proposals with "high-end" budgets may be reduced or not funded.

Pfund: No applicant may seek more than \$20,000 for a maximum one-year period.

D. PROJECT DURATION

No applicant may seek more than three years of support under RCS or one year of support under Pfund.

E. FUNDS AVAILABLE

The FY 2015-16 Support Fund Plan and Budget allocates \$1,350,000 to fund new awards in RCS and \$400,000 for new awards in Pfund. The Support Fund, however, has in recent years received substantially less income than projections indicated; thus the actual amount available for new awards in the R & D subprograms may be reduced.

F. COST SHARING, MATCHING COMMITMENTS, AND INDIRECT COST RATE

In calculating the Support Fund request, an indirect cost rate of 25% will be permitted only on salaries, wages, and fringe benefits. If provided as institutional match, indirect costs may be calculated using the submitting institution's federally negotiated rate.

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. Further, electronic submission of the proposal by the campus serves as 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 which is expended.

IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ALL APPLICANTS

For all equipment requests under RCS and Pfund, the submitting institution must provide, and cite on the appropriate budget page(s), a cash match equal to or greater than 25% of the total cost of the requested equipment. Each match must be provided by the submitting institution. Review panels will have authority to recommend to the Board that any application requesting funds for equipment, but lacking the required equipment match, be reduced or not funded.

G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE

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

Electronic submission of the proposal by the institution 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 and eligibility requirements of the RCS subprogram or Pfund component as described in this RFP; (3) is in the

format required by the Board; and (4) where appropriate, has been reviewed by officials within a particular system to ensure that the proposal does not duplicate research currently or formerly funded on a member campus.

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

Board policies stipulate that proposals submitted to the Board of Regents for funding consideration will undergo a merit review by out-of-state experts in the priority areas. Considerable care will be taken to ensure that these reviewers are: (1) expert researchers in their fields; (2) impartial evaluators; and (3) selected, when appropriate, from both academic and non-academic settings.

Separate reviews are conducted for the RCS subprogram and the Pfund; however, the review process will involve at least two stages for RCS and one for Pfund:

1. RCS: Out-of-state experts familiar with the area of research will review each proposal. Mail reviewers are required primarily to assess (a) the extent to which a given proposal meets the criteria of the particular subprogram under which it was submitted; and (b) using national standards of excellence, the quality and relative merits of the proposed research and research plan. The final panel uses these evaluations for informational purposes when determining final rankings. (See Appendix B for sample in-depth evaluation forms.)

Pfund: For each proposal, two (2) out-of-state experts familiar with the subject-area will review the proposal application independently. Reviewers are required to assess (a) the extent to which a given proposal meets Pfund criteria; and (b) using national standards of excellence, the quality and relative merits of the proposed research and research plan. The score accessed by each reviewer will be averaged and all proposals ranked in order of prioritization based on the highest average score. The BoRSF staff will use the ranked order of prioritization as recommendations for funding subject to Board approval. (See Appendix B for sample in-depth evaluation forms.)

2. Final Panel Evaluation

A team of out-of-state experts will prepare a report which ranks all proposals included in the mail review. In arriving at its conclusions, this panel considers the objectives and guidelines for the appropriate subprogram, the scores and comments from the mail reviewers, and any additional pertinent written comments. The final panel may suggest budgetary revisions as it deems necessary and appropriate, taking into consideration the recommendations of the mail reviewers.

NOTE: In light of matching requirements instituted in this RFP, i.e., a 25% of cost minimum cash match for all equipment requests, panels will be advised that, although they may not recommend that a higher level of matching commitment be required, they may--at their discretion--recommend that a project not be funded or be funded at a reduced level based on the amount of its matching commitments.

I. FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED

After receiving recommendations of out-of-state experts, the Board of Regents decides which proposals will be funded. **The Board of Regents staff, acting on behalf of the Board, sets documentary requirements for the processing and execution of contracts resulting from proposals approved for funding by the Board.**

J. DEBRIEFING

Copies of rating forms completed by out-of-state experts will be provided to all applicants in late July 2015.

K. TIMETABLE

Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants through the Support Fund R & D program will apply for FY 2015-16. **If the following date(s) falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadline(s) will be extended until 4:30 P.M. Central time of the next working weekday:**

July 2015	Request for Proposals Issued
September 11, 2015, 4:30 p.m., Central	Notices of Intent Due (RCS and Pfund) through LOGAN
October 15, 2015, 4:30 p.m., Central	Last Day that Potential Applicants May Ask Questions About the RFP
November 7, 2015, 4:30 p.m., Central	Deadline for Receipt of RCS or Pfund Proposals through LOGAN
November 2015 – March 2016	Proposals Transmitted to and Reviewed by Out-of-State Experts
April 2016	Reports and Recommendations of Out-of-State Experts Forwarded to Institutions of Higher Education
April 2016	Final Action by the Board
May – June 2016	Contracts Negotiated and Executed
July 2016	Dissemination of Debriefing Information

L. EVALUATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS AND REPORTS REQUIRED

The Board of Regents requires that institutions receiving monies from the Support Fund report periodically on the utilization of these monies. All components of the 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 consultants may be utilized in the evaluation process.

Periodically, the Board of Regents may conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of each funded project. At a minimum, annual progress and financial status reports will be required of the principal investigator.

M. PREVIOUS SUBMISSIONS

Submission of a notice of intent and a research proposal in a previous funding cycle does not relieve the applicant of the requirement set forth in this RFP of submitting another notice of intent and full proposal if he/she wants the same or a similar proposal to be considered in the current funding cycle. This rule holds true regardless of whether the proposal was among those that were considered meritorious and recommended for funding by a peer review panel. The Board always receives far more research proposals that are worthy of funding than it can fund. Additionally, the fact that a proposal was recommended for funding in a previous year is not an indication that the proposal will automatically be funded in the next funding cycle, even if another notice of intent and full proposal are submitted.

IV. PROCEDURE AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF NOTICES OF INTENT & PROPOSALS

A. NOTICES OF INTENT

Before a full RCS or Pfund proposal will be accepted, the applicant must first submit a completed notice of intent form for the research proposal to be submitted. The notice of intent must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m. Central, September 11, 2015. One of the primary purposes of the notice of intent is to assist the Support Fund R & D Program staff in identifying potential reviewers. Failure to provide the required information on potential reviewers as described in the instructions in LOGAN, including email addresses, may result in disqualification of the notice of intent. In this event, the full proposal for which the notice of intent was filed will not be accepted.

NOTE: All rules, regulations, and limitations in the RFP for RCS or Pfund research proposals (e.g., limitations on the maximum amount of funds that may be requested per annum, the number of proposals that may be submitted) also hold true for the RCS or Pfund notice of intent. Note that both notice of intent and proposal submission processes include two steps: submission by the PI

to the campus, and campus approval with submission to the Board or Regents; a proposal cannot be accepted by the Board until both steps are completed.

B. PROPOSALS

Full proposals must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m. Central on the due date set forth for the RCS subprogram or Pfund component under which the application is being submitted, as listed in section "III.K. Timetable" of this RFP. After the applicant submits the completed proposal to his/her designated campus office via LOGAN, he/she will receive a sequence of three emails: (1) immediately following the applicant's submission to the campus, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal by the campus; (2) following institutional approval and submission, confirmation that the Regents have received the proposal; and (3) as soon as possible after the subprogram submission deadline, an indication of whether the proposal has been submitted in compliance with RFP instructions or disqualified for lack of compliance. The campus will be copied on all confirmations.

If necessary, the title of the proposed research and the amount of funds requested in the RCS or Pfund notice of intent may be changed slightly when the full RCS or Pfund proposal is submitted. The discipline under which the proposal is submitted, however, must be the same as that under which the RCS or Pfund notice of intent was submitted.

C. COMPLETION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS ON OR BEFORE CITED DEADLINES

Submission deadlines are absolute; all campus work on the proposal, including final approval and submission to the Board of Regents by the designated campus office, must be completed on or before the deadline date and time. The online proposal submission system is programmed to close at the deadline(s) cited in this RFP.

V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

The following requirements and format for research proposals must be followed closely. Proposals which do not adhere to these guidelines will be disqualified for noncompliance and eliminated from funding consideration.

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND STIPULATIONS

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.

1. LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS THAT MAY BE SUBMITTED: An applicant may submit a maximum of one research proposal in the RCS or Pfund with the applicant listed as "Principal or Co-Principal Investigator". An applicant may be listed as "Other Investigator" on additional RCS or Pfund proposals.
2. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS: Notices of intent and proposals must be submitted via LOGAN. The LOGAN submission system may be accessed at <https://web.laregents.org> by clicking LOGAN on the menu at the top of the page.
3. GENERAL FORMAT STIPULATIONS: All narrative sections of the proposal must be presented in a single PDF document with pages numbered, 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and on each side, and in type no smaller than 12 point. Forms must be completed and proposals submitted via LOGAN.
4. ADDENDA SUBMITTED BEFORE OR AFTER RECEIPT OF PROPOSAL: Proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission. No addenda (e.g., letters of support) will be accepted after receipt of the proposal or separate from the LOGAN submission.
5. GUIDELINES FOR IDENTIFYING, LABELING AND CERTIFYING THE CONFIDENTIAL NATURE OF INFORMATION CONTAINED IN RESEARCH PROPOSALS: Without assuming any liability for inadvertent disclosure and except for purposes of evaluation, the Board of Regents will limit dissemination of, or access to, information certified to be of confidential or proprietary nature which falls into a category described by R.S. 44:4(16), as long as the following conditions and assurances have been met and guidelines have been followed:

- a. The information to be protected must accompany the full proposal and each component of the information to be protected must be clearly and conspicuously identified and marked as confidential. Revisions, amendments, and addenda will not be accepted after the proposal has been submitted or separate from the LOGAN submission.
- b. A letter must be included in the appendix which:
 - i. Briefly explains and certifies the need for confidentiality;
 - ii. Contains complete identification and mailing addresses of all entities (faculty or staff members, private or public concerns) which have a right to, or ownership of, the confidential information;
 - iii. In the case of public institutions of higher education, provides assurance that this request is in accordance with the rules and regulations adopted by the institution's management board with respect to R.S. 44:4(16); and
 - iv. Is signed by all entities identified in V.A.5.b.ii.
- c. The information to be protected and the letter described in V.A.5.a. and V.A.5.b. must be reviewed by the chief administrator of the applicant's university or his/her designee, and he/she must certify in writing that the information is of a confidential or proprietary nature which falls into a category described by R.S. 44:4(16). This signed certification must be included in the appendix.

A person or entity wishing access to documents and/or records as defined previously in this section may request such access by making a specific request to the researcher(s) and any other entity having a proprietary interest. Concurrence among all entities having a proprietary interest is required prior to release of information previously deemed confidential. In cases of denial of a request for access to protected information, the only recourse is an appeal through a court of law. The Board of Regents does not assume any liability for the release of protected information when the release is ordered in accordance with State or Federal laws.

6. GUIDELINES FOR PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS OR VERTEBRATE ANIMALS

- a. Use of Human Subjects. Consistent with the relevant Federal policy known as the Common Rule for Behavioral and Social Science Research (*Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects*, 45 CFR 690), Board-sponsored projects involving research with human subjects must ensure that they are protected from research risks. All proposals involving the use of human subjects either must have approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) before an award is made, or affirm that the IRB has declared the research exempt from continued oversight. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with their institutional IRB during proposal planning and preparation; and prior to proposal submission.
- b. Use of Vertebrate Animals. Consistent with the requirements of the Animal Welfare Act [7 U.S.C. 2131 et seq] and the regulations promulgated thereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture [9 CFR, 1.1-4.11], the Board requires that proposed projects involving the use of vertebrate animals for research or education be approved by the submitting institution's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) before an award can be made. Therefore, applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with their institutional IACUC during proposal planning and preparation.

For proposals involving the use of vertebrate animals, sufficient information should be provided within the fifteen-page (RCS) or five-page (Pfund) narrative and bibliography (see V.B.4), or in the proposal appendix, to enable reviewers to evaluate the choice of species, number of animals to be used, and any necessary exposure of animals to discomfort, pain, or injury. **It is no longer necessary, however, to complete the process of IACUC approval unless and until the proposal is recommended for funding.**

If the proposal is recommended for funding, a letter of approval for intended human/animal protocols by the appropriate IRB or IACUC involving experiments (i.e., surveys, etc.) with human subjects and/or animal subjects **must** be provided prior to contract execution. Also, if applicable, any changes in protocols from that contained in the original proposal should also be indicated and accompany the assurance of IRB/IACUC approval.

B. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

For access to LOGAN submission instructions, go to <https://web.laregents.org> and click LOGAN on the menu at the top of the page.

1. COVER PAGE: The form is available and must be completed in LOGAN.

2. **PROJECT SUMMARY:** The project summary may contain a maximum of 250 words and must be entered in the appropriate section in LOGAN.
3. **GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:** The final goal to be reached by the end of the grant period, and/or annual goals for any intervening years, must be clearly specified. Major changes in research programs and/or scientific personnel that can be expected when these goals are achieved must be described. This section of the proposal must be no longer than the equivalent of one, single-spaced, typewritten page and uploaded to LOGAN as a separate .pdf document.
4. **NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY:** The proposal narrative must be uploaded to LOGAN as a PDF and adhere to the following requirements: The narrative must not exceed the following limits of single-spaced pages with a type size of 12 point or greater: a. fifteen (15) for RCS; and b. five (5) for Pfund. Pages must have 1-inch margins and be numbered. Reviewers are not required to read additional narrative pages. Information applicable in multiple places may be referenced by page and paragraph. The narrative should conform to the following outline, including all major sections and subsections. If a section or subsection does not apply to the project, include the appropriate heading followed by "Does not apply." Proposal reviewers will assign points based on the quality and specificity of each section. For multi-institutional proposals, as appropriate throughout the narrative section, explain the multi-campus agreement(s) in the context of shared funding, resources, arrangements by which the various institutions will share the benefits of the proposed project, and/or cost savings to the State. Also provide documentation in the proposal appendix describing the exact nature of the agreement between/among the institutions involved.

NOTE: Narrative page limits in both components do not include the bibliography. The bibliography shall not exceed two (2) pages.

a. Rationale of the Project

RCS Proposals Must:

- i. Assess potential for achieving national competitiveness, including current status and identification of barriers to achieving competitiveness.
- ii. Include a detailed plan for achieving national competitiveness, indicating the specific strategies, actions, methods, and additional resources proposed to accomplish the stated goals.
- iii. Provide, if available, critiques of proposals submitted to Federal funding agencies (or other funding sources) if they provide information that would help Support Fund evaluators assess either (1) the potential competitive status of the applicant, in general; or (2) the potential competitive status of the same (or a very similar) proposal, in particular. Support Fund reviewers will be instructed to give additional consideration to those applicants and proposals for which such critiques indicate a high likelihood of success, contingent upon the applicant's overcoming certain barriers (e.g., collecting preliminary data).

Pfund Proposals Must:

- I. Describe the significance of the project relative to research in its general field;
- II. Provide a statement of work, listing the major research tasks to be carried out, a timeline for accomplishing the tasks, and expected outcomes;
- III. (For tenure-track faculty) Explain how the project will help the investigator sharpen his/her research focus and/or develop cutting-edge techniques that can enable the investigator to become more competitive in obtaining federal funding;
- IV. (For tenured faculty) Explain how the project will help the investigator develop innovative or novel concepts and pursue new areas of research that require a shift in the current research focus to become more competitive for federal funding; and
- V. Describe the potential for the project to secure federal funding, e.g., planned proposal submissions that could result from the work.

b. Research Plan

Both RCS and Pfund Proposals Must:

- i. Briefly summarize the expected significance, methods, limitations, and relationship of the study to the present state of knowledge in the field and to comparable work in progress elsewhere.
- ii. Provide a schedule of proposed activities within the grant period of three years or less for RCS, and one year for Pfund, with benchmarks indicated throughout the proposed grant period.
- iii. Provide performance measures which 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.
- iv. Include plans for publications and a description of how the level of competitive research achieved during the period of the Board's grant will be maintained after this funding ends.

c. Involvement and Qualifications of Investigators, Other Faculty, and Students

Qualifications of investigators to undertake the proposed research should be indicated. A brief statement should be included that describes the responsibilities of each person involved, the amount of time/effort each person will devote to the project, whether release time will be given and, if so, the amount, type, and duration of release time. Proposals must clearly identify the role of, and salary requested for, any senior personnel.

A description of any supportive and/or interdisciplinary expertise needed to enhance the potential success of the research, including joint research activities with other researchers or research groups at the same or other institutions, must be provided.

If funds for assistantships, postdoctoral appointments, visiting faculty, etc., are requested, their roles in accomplishing objectives of the program must be clearly identified.

d. Institutional Capabilities and Commitment

Institutional capabilities and commitment with respect to the proposed research must be described, including available facilities and major items of equipment especially adapted or suited to the proposed research.

e. Bibliography (see Section V.B.4)

5. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE: (Also see Section III.F of the RFP relative to RCS cost sharing commitments, matching commitments, and indirect cost rates.)

Budget forms must be completed in LOGAN. Corresponding budget narratives will be uploaded separately.

The amount of RCS Support Fund money requested for successive years of a research project should decrease as researchers become consistently competitive in obtaining Federal funding.

a. Format

A completed budget must be submitted in LOGAN for each year for which support is requested. A corresponding budget narrative must be provided for each year which fully explains every item for which the expenditure of Support Fund money is proposed. **A full line item explanation of institutional cost sharing and/or matching support must also be included.** A cumulative budget will automatically be generated from the annual budget. No cumulative narrative is required.

NOTE: All matching funds for which the principal investigator has received a commitment and which are cited in the text of the application must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget justification section.

b. Project Activation Date and Anticipated Date of Completion

The project activation date is June 1, 2016, and the termination date is no later than June 30 of the year in which the principal investigator envisions the project should terminate, not to exceed a total of three years (RCS) and one year (Pfund).

No-cost extensions may be requested to complete project activities per Louisiana R. S. 39:1514. 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 awards 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.”

NOTE: In the event an applicant receives notification of external funding during the BoRSF contract negotiation/execution for a project(s) which funding stipulations specifically indicate should make the principal investigator ineligible for funding, the principal investigator shall notify the Board within five (5) business days of award notification. Failure to report this information may result in immediate contract cancellation.

c. Disallowed Budgetary Items

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 for why what they are proposing does not violate this stipulation. Applicants should also be aware that the Support Fund Program staff will make the final panel of out-of-state evaluators aware of this Constitutional prohibition, as well as the current economic climate for higher education in Louisiana. The panel 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. Board of Regents Support Fund money may not be used to support regular, ongoing operating costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects.

The scope of the Support Fund R & D Program also does not permit: (1) purchase of office furniture or routine office equipment (e.g., standard desktop computers for faculty offices); (2) construction of facilities; (3) maintenance of equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund; (4) routine renovation, expansion in size, or upgrading; (5) compensation of 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; or (6) similarly, the payment of honoraria to faculty, whether they are involved in or external to the proposal, to learn how to use Support Fund-purchased equipment. Faculty professional development time in question should either be provided as part of the institutional match or donated by the faculty concerned.

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. Finally, funds may not be requested for proposed centers or institutes which require Board of Regents approval prior to their establishment and which have not been previously approved.

Potential applicants should note that funds may be requested for foreign travel. If the project is funded, however, permission for foreign travel must be obtained from the Division of Administration, as stipulated in the State General Travel Regulations. Discounts received for equipment purchases are not eligible as part of the institutional match.

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.

All costs for telephone, faxing, email, telegraph, and postage are disallowed. Costs of printing annual/progress reports to the Board of Regents are disallowed.

d. Funds for Principal Investigators (RCS only) and Support Personnel

RCS Principal Investigator(s) may request partial salary support at an annual amount not to exceed 25% academic year salary plus two months’ summer support. Pfund investigators may not request salary or fringe benefits. **Requests for academic year salary support are to be based on the investigator’s regular compensation for the continuous period which, under the policy of the institution concerned, constitutes the basis of the investigator’s salary. Summer salary requests are to be at a monthly rate not to exceed the base salary divided by the number of months for which summer salary is to be paid.**

If funds for graduate or undergraduate assistants, postdoctoral researchers, visiting faculty, etc., are requested, their roles in accomplishing objectives of the program must be clearly identified, and the budget must clearly show the percentage of time they will be involved and the rate of pay. **The principal investigator must request the Board's prior approval to compensate support personnel, including postdoctoral research associates, research technicians, and/or graduate assistants, at higher levels than those requested in the proposal and/or specified by the funding stipulations for a grant.**

Current annual or academic year salaries (FY 2015-16) for principal and co-principal investigators and support personnel requesting salary support must be stated in the proposal if applicable. Moreover, if salary support is requested, the applicants must certify that: (1) Support Fund monies will not supplant State funds; and (2) full-time employees will not, under any circumstances, receive funds in excess of 100% of their regular salary through Support Fund monies. BoRSF salary support for other investigators (senior advisory faculty) may not be requested. Institutions are permitted and encouraged to supplement salaries, if necessary, in the form of an institutional match.

No-cost extensions granted by the Board will not entitle principal or co-principal investigators to rebudget funds for additional salary support.

e. Support for Graduate Education

Graduate assistant funding requested from the Board or pledged as an institutional and/or private match must be maintained in full if a proposal is recommended for funding. If suitable graduate students are not available, the principal investigator must request the Board's prior approval to rebudget these funds, and may use them for the support of postdoctoral researchers, technical personnel, and/or qualified student workers only. Funds for tuition support are strictly prohibited.

Support Fund money may not be requested to pay fringe benefits for graduate assistants or graduate and undergraduate student workers. However, tuition, fees and fringe benefits for graduate and/or undergraduate students may be provided as part of an institution's match.

f. Equipment

The Support Fund R & D program is not an equipment grants program. Equipment may be requested only in the context of the particular research initiative proposed and the request must contain, at a minimum, a cash match equal to or greater than 25% of the total cost of the requested equipment and must be provided by the applicant's employing institution. Applicants should note that, when all else is equal, priority will be given to proposals with a match greater than the minimum. If equipment is requested, the proposal must contain: (1) a description of the equipment, as well as who would use it and in what capacity; (2) a plan for shared use, if appropriate; (3) a plan for the technical operation and maintenance of the equipment both during the award period and after the Support Fund award ends; and (4) a justification of need for the equipment.

6. **CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT/HISTORY OF SUPPORT:** Applicants **must** complete both the "Current and Pending Support" form, and the "History of Support" form, both available in LOGAN. The "History of Support" form must describe, at a minimum, the last five years of support.

NOTE: Where appropriate on either or both forms, the applicant must include information [including the BoRSF contract number(s)] about all previous Support Fund awards received for which he or she was either the principal investigator or a co-principal investigator.

7. **BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Biographical sketches for all key personnel and consultants (if appropriate) are limited to two pages and must be provided in the form available in LOGAN.
8. **PROPOSAL APPENDIX:** Essential material supplementary to the text of the proposal should be uploaded as a single .pdf document. The appendix must be referenced in the proposal narrative, and under no circumstances may the total page count for all materials exceed 15 pages for RCS and 5 pages for Pfund. All material must be submitted in LOGAN; supplementary documents (published books, compact disks, printed photos, etc.) will not be accepted.

a. Attachments/Supplemental Information

All general supporting materials (e.g., charts, photos) to which reference is made in the narrative section must be clearly marked and included in this section.

b. Letters of Support

Although the applicant ultimately must decide whether letters of support are needed, their addition is strongly encouraged in instances where (1) an agency (other than the applicant's employing institution) or a person (other than the project personnel) will assist or collaborate in the research in some manner. Either in the letter of support or in a separate statement, the extent to which the collaborating agency and/or individual will assist or collaborate must be made clear.

Additionally, if the agency or person is to be paid from money provided by the Support Fund, the rate of pay should be included in the budget justification. Letters of support that are forwarded to the Board's office separately from the full proposal--either before or after submission--will not be accepted.

APPENDIX A

TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES FOR THE R&D PROGRAM

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/Theater 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 and 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

(2015)

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS

Form 6.3: RCS Mail Review Form

Form 6.4: RCS Subject-Area Review Form

Form 6.51: Pfund Proposal Evaluation "Tenured" Applicants

Form 6.52: Pfund Proposal Evaluation "Tenure-Track" Applicants

OUT-OF-STATE MAIL REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

DUE DATE:

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS SUBPROGRAM (RCS)

DIRECTIONS: Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The greater the number, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Use the space provided to explain your ratings, especially on items given low ratings (e.g., 1 or 2). These comments will be particularly helpful to the expert panels who subsequently will review this application in conjunction with your evaluation. Attach additional pages as needed.

CRITERION I: POTENTIAL FOR ACHIEVING NATIONALLY COMPETITIVE STATUS AND EXISTING CAPABILITIES TO IMPLEMENT PROJECT

- Low ----- High
1. The training, experience, and research accomplishments of the principal investigator(s) indicate that they are not yet nationally competitive, but may reasonably be expected to achieve nationally competitive status within the three-year period allowed. 1 2 3 4 5
List any investigators who either:
(a) lack the potential to achieve national competitiveness _____
or
(b) are already competitive _____
 2. The likelihood and volume of federal funding for research in the field of the application is high. 1 2 3 4 5
Identify agencies which would be interested in this area of research: (e.g., NSF) _____

 3. The investigator clearly identifies barriers to achieving nationally competitive status in sponsored research. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

4. The proposal includes a realistic plan/strategy for eliminating or reducing barriers which will significantly improve the ability of the applicant to compete nationally by the end of the grant period. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

5. The institutional capabilities, commitment, and support suggest high potential for success. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

6. The proposed research provides an effective foundation on which the individual or department can build a successful program. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

Low -----High

7. (Answer Only If Applicable)
- (a) The applicant is already an established investigator (as indicated in #1 above), but is moving into a new field of research in which he/she is not yet competitive; and 1 2 3 4 5
 - (b) The applicant has made a convincing case that the topic of this application is a significant departure from his/her past research and has addressed, in a meaningful manner, items 1-4 above. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

8. (Answer Only If Applicable) Critiques of proposals submitted to Federal funding agencies (or other funding sources) indicate a high likelihood of success, contingent upon the applicant's overcoming certain barriers (e.g., collecting preliminary data). 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

CRITERION II: SCIENTIFIC RIGOR OF THE PROPOSAL & ITS RELEVANCE TO FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH

1. The proposed research meets contemporary national standards of appropriateness, excellence, and innovation. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

2. The proposal presents a well-conceived, technically sound, and feasible plan of research. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

3. The proposal seeks to develop fundamental knowledge, not simply apply it. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

4. There is a significant likelihood of new discoveries or fundamental advances within the field. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

Low -----High

5. The proposed research will make a significant contribution to basic science. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

6. The proposed research has a high potential for contributing to the quality or effectiveness of U.S. research. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

CRITERION III: BUDGETARY CONSIDERATIONS - Because of the limited funds available and the large number of high quality proposals submitted in this program, your comments about the budget are particularly important.

1. The proposed budget is reasonable for the scope of work to be performed 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

2. Personnel costs are appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

3. Equipment/supply costs are appropriate. 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

4. If Board of Regents Support Fund money is requested for academic release time, the request is adequately justified (e.g., the research, as proposed, makes release time essential). 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION TO THE SUBJECT-AREA PANEL

This proposal clearly demonstrates strong potential for enabling the principal investigator to achieve competitive status in the Federal R & D marketplace within a three-year time span and certainly should be considered further in the review process.

As submitted, this proposal should not be recommended for funding because:

_____ It is inappropriate to the program.

_____ Although the research may have merit, the proposal does not assess barriers to competitive research and develop a plan to overcome them.

_____ The research may have some potential for enhancing competitive status; however, as currently conceived and written, it does not appear to demonstrate strong potential for enhancing competitive status in the Federal R & D marketplace within a three-year time span.

_____ The training and experience of the principal investigator(s), as reflected in this proposal, do not suggest a high likelihood of achieving national competitiveness by the conclusion of the grant period.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

SUBJECT-AREA PANEL PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS SUBPROGRAM (RCS)

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the subject-area panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. This form, along with other assessments, will be used by the Final Review Panel to determine whether a proposal merits funding. 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. Please provide comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

A. EXISTING CAPABILITIES TO IMPLEMENT PROJECT

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 1. Identification and substantiation of barriers to competitiveness | __ of <u>10</u> points |
| 2. Adequacy of institutional capabilities as base for building competitiveness | __ of <u>5</u> points |
| 3. Training, past performance, and potential of investigators | __ of <u>10</u> points |

Identify investigators listed in this proposal who are already established national competitors: (see p. 2 of RFP)

Identify investigators listed in this proposal who lack potential to become national competitors:

SUBTOTAL A: _____ of 25 points

COMMENTS:

B. SCIENTIFIC MERIT (Using national standards of excellence)

- | | |
|--|------------------------|
| 1. Technical soundness | __ of <u>10</u> points |
| 2. Likelihood of new discoveries or fundamental advances within field | __ of <u>10</u> points |
| 3. Impact on progress in this or other fields | __ of <u>5</u> points |
| 4. Contribution to basic science | __ of <u>5</u> points |
| 5. Utility or relevance of research to improved technology or society | __ of <u>5</u> points |
| 6. Potential for contribution to quality or effectiveness of U.S. research | __ of <u>5</u> points |

SUBTOTAL B: _____ of 40 points

COMMENTS:

C. POTENTIAL FOR COMPETITIVENESS

- 1. Effectiveness of plan to overcome existing barriers _____ of 10 points
- 2. Likelihood that funding of project will result in competitive status for Federal support _____ of 10 points
Identify agencies: (e.g., NSF) _____
- 3. General funding prospects for this area of research by Federal agencies _____ of 5 points
Identify agencies: (e.g., NSF) _____

SUBTOTAL C: _____ of 25 points

COMMENTS:

D. APPROPRIATENESS OF BUDGET

- 1. Reasonable for scope of work to be performed _____ of 4 points
- 2. Appropriate for personnel costs _____ of 3 points
- 3. Appropriate for equipment/supply costs _____ of 3 points

SUBTOTAL D: _____ of 10 points

COMMENTS

SCORE (A through D): _____ OF 100 POINTS

OVERALL RATING OF PROPOSAL

POOR	FAIR	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION AND COMMENTS OF THE SUBJECT-AREA PANEL

Directions: *Please summarize the conclusions of the subject-area panel with regard to this proposal. Be sure to address any differences in opinion the panel may have had with the mail reviewer(s).*

ADDITIONAL 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 research proposal.

Primary Discussant, Subject-Area Panel: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund) Component

Proposal Evaluation Form for **TENURED Applicants**

Principal Investigator name: _____ PI Institution: _____

Instructions: Please read the RFP, the proposal, and all accompanying information carefully, then score the proposal, using the following criteria and point allowances:

Criteria	Points awarded
1. Does the proposed research project appear to be technically and scientifically sound? In particular, does the proposed research indicate a significant shift in the applicant’s research focus? (50 points)	_____
2. Do the proposed research and supporting materials provide convincing evidence of the potential to attract federal funding in the near term? (40 points)	_____
3. Are the budget, timeline, and infrastructure reasonable to ensure success? (10 points)	_____
4. Total Score (of a possible 100 points)	_____

Please provide constructive comments that can be relayed to the applicant. Use additional pages if necessary. (Your identity will be kept confidential.)

Reviewer’s Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name:

By signing this form (or printing your name where indicated and returning this form electronically), you agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation, and material of any kind (hereafter referred to as “Material”) included in this proposal. You further agree not to divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said “Material” without written permission of the principal investigator. You also certify that, to the best of your knowledge, no conflict of interest exists or is created as a result of your review of this proposal. Consultant also certifies that he/she is not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for disbarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.

Pilot Funding for New Research (Pfund) Component

Proposal Evaluation Form for **TENURE-TRACK Applicants**

Principal Investigator name: _____ PI Institution: _____

Instructions: Please read the RFP, the proposal, and all accompanying information carefully, then score the proposal, using the following criteria and point allowances:

Criteria	Points awarded
1. Does the proposed research project appear to be technically and scientifically sound? Will the proposed research significantly enhance the applicant’s research focus, substantially advance the exploration of new ideas, and/or enable the applicant to become proficient in utilizing cutting-edge techniques? (50 points)	_____
2. Do the proposed research and supporting materials provide convincing evidence of the potential to attract federal funding in the near term? (40 points)	_____
3. Are the budget, timeline, and infrastructure reasonable to ensure success? (10 points)	_____
4. Total Score (of a possible 100 points)	_____

Please provide constructive comments that can be relayed to the applicant. Use additional pages if necessary. (Your identity will be kept confidential.)

Reviewer’s Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Printed Name:

By signing this form (or printing your name where indicated and returning this form electronically), you agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation, and material of any kind (hereafter referred to as “Material”) included in this proposal. You further agree not to divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said “Material” without written permission of the principal investigator. You also certify that, to the best of your knowledge, no conflict of interest exists or is created as a result of your review of this proposal. Consultant also certifies that he/she is not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for disbarment, declared ineligible, or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal department or agency.