

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Guidelines for the Submission of

Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Proposals

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

**Proposals Due:
October 24, 2009
5:00 p.m.**

FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

Request for Proposals, Number 2009-05

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<http://web.laregents.org>

Revised: 8/2009

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, NUMBER 2009-05

IMPORTANT NOTICES

1. Inquiries about this RFP

In accordance with R.S. 39:1503, written and oral inquiries about this request for proposals (RFP) will be accepted until 4:30 p.m., **October 1, 2009**. Inquiries about the Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Program, RFP Number 09-05, should be directed to Ms. Noreen Lockett, Enhancement Program Manager, at (225) 342-4253 or email noreen.lockett@la.gov, or Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, at (225) 342-4253 or email bryan.jones@la.gov. No inquiry will be accepted—whether written or oral—after that date. Operating in this manner ensures that all interested parties receive the same information.

2. Suggestions for Improvements in this RFP

The Board of Regents actively solicits constructive suggestions about ways in which this RFP can be improved. All such suggestions must be received no later than October 1, 2009 to be considered prior to the issuance of the next RFP.

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

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

4. Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions

Regulations governing proposal submission for FY 2009-10 under the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions will be promulgated in a separate RFP.

5. Availability of the RFP on the Internet

As part of the Board's ongoing effort to streamline RFPs, and to ensure that this document is as widely disseminated as possible while minimizing the number of paper copies that institutions must produce, this RFP is available on the Internet: <http://laregents.org> under the "Downloads" main menu and "Forms and RFPs."

6. Proposal Submission Deadlines

An electronic and eight (8) hard copies (one with original signatures) are due on October 24, 2009. If this date falls on a holiday or weekend, proposals are due at 5:00 p.m. on the following weekday.

This is the second cycle in which all Enhancement Program proposals will be submitted through the Louisiana Online Grant Automation Network (LOGAN). The directions for submitting proposals electronically will be available on October 1, 2009 at <http://web.laregents.org/support>. This RFP includes directions for submitting the required hard copies of the proposal (one with original signatures), which the applicant will print from the completed copy that the applicant submits electronically through LOGAN. The official copy is the online version.

For help with electronic submission questions, please e-mail karthik@la.gov after **October 1, 2009**, but before **October 17, 2009**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. General Information.....	1
A. Basis of Authority	1
B. Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund	1
C. Public Nature of Proposals Submitted.....	1
D. Enhancement Program Administrator; Questions About This RFP	1
II. Types of Enhancement Subprograms.....	1
III. The Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Programs	2
A. Objectives.....	2
B. Eligibility Considerations.....	2
1. Eligible Faculty.....	2
2. Eligible Institutions.....	2
3. Eligible Activities	3
4. Eligibility of Duplicate Proposals	3
5. Eligible Disciplines.....	4
C. Monetary Limitations	5
D. Duration.....	5
E. Funds Available.....	5
1. Traditional Enhancement Program	5
2. Undergraduate Enhancement Program	5
F. Cost Sharing and Matching Commitments.....	5
G. Institutional Screening Committee	6
H. Assessment of Proposals by Out-of-State Experts	6
I. Final Selection of Proposals to be Funded	6
J. Debriefing.....	6
K. Timetable.....	6
L. Post-Award Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required	7
M. Eligibility of Continuation Proposals.....	7
IV. Procedures and Deadlines for Submission of Proposals	7
V. Proposal Requirements and Format	8
Appendix A: Taxonomy of Disciplines	
Appendix B: Sample Proposal Evaluation Forms	

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. BASIS OF AUTHORITY

Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution established two funds in the state treasury: the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) and the Board of Regents Support Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Board of Regents Support Fund or Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received from settlement of disputed oil and gas revenues generated in the so-called 8(g) section of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of money in the Trust Fund, as well as 25 percent 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 percent of the interest earned and 75% of the recurring oil and gas revenues are placed in the Support Fund for appropriation by the Legislature.

B. PURPOSES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

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

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

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

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

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

C. PUBLIC NATURE OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

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

D. ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS; QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS RFP

Specific questions concerning this RFP and the requirements set forth herein should be directed to Mr. John Wallin, Associate Commissioner for Sponsored Programs Administration, Ms. Noreen Lockett, Enhancement Program Manager, or Mr. Bryan Jones, Enhancement Program Manager, of the Support Fund Program staff, at (225) 342-4253 or john.wallin@la.gov, noreen.lockett@la.gov, or bryan.jones@la.gov. In compliance with R.S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 1, 2009. As soon as possible after that date, all questions asked about this RFP and all answers provided in response to these questions will be transcribed and forwarded to all institutions of higher education. To ensure that all parties receive the same information, no inquiries, whether oral or written, will be accepted after the deadline date.

II. TYPES OF ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAMS

The Enhancement Program consists of three components: the Endowed Professorships Program; the Traditional Enhancement Program (including multidisciplinary); and the Undergraduate Enhancement Program. Potential applicants should be aware that: (1) the requirements for these programs vary; and (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals. The Endowed Professorships Program is explained in detail in other documents. Contact the Board's offices or web site for more information on this subprogram. For FY 2009-10, there will again be an Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions which has a separate RFP.

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

III. THE TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAMS

A. OBJECTIVES

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

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

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

B. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS

1. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only those individuals affiliated with an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists, and/or engineers or employees of industry) may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal or co-investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:**

a. TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM: The Board's Policy for Administration stipulates that departments and units at public four-year institutions of higher education, and two-year institutions which are members of Louisiana Community and Technical College System, and regionally-accredited independent institutions of higher education which are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities are eligible to compete under the Traditional Enhancement Program. Technical colleges are not eligible to compete unless they collaborate with a two- or four-year eligible institution.

b. UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM: The Undergraduate Enhancement Program was created by the Board to affirm the principle that improvement of infrastructure is essential at all academic levels and to encourage colleges and universities without sizable graduate programs to participate in the Support Fund Enhancement Program. Additional prerequisites for participation in this program are as follows: (1) the campus must offer two or fewer doctoral programs; and (2) the department applying must not offer a doctoral degree. Participation in this program will not preclude these campuses from competing for other Enhancement money, and quality considerations will continue to form the basis for all funding decisions.

c. MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL AND/OR MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS WHICH PROPOSE TO SHARE SCARCE STATE RESOURCES AND PROMISE A BENEFICIAL IMPACT ON NUMEROUS INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN LOUISIANA:

Since the inception of the Support Fund Program, the Board has seen an increase in the number of Enhancement requests which, because they are multidisciplinary in scope--and frequently multi-institutional, do not fit well into the Board's discipline-specific review process. Seeking to encourage those applications which propose to share scarce resources, while remaining faithful to the original goals and precepts of the Support Fund Enhancement Program, in 1993 the Board developed a mechanism to review applications which fit the description "Interinstitutional and/or interdisciplinary proposals that propose to share resources and promise a beneficial impact on numerous institutions of higher education in Louisiana." The Board has subsequently refined its review process based on the recommendations of its Planning Committee relative to the review of these types of applications.

For those applications which "propose to share resources and promise a beneficial impact on numerous institutions of higher education in Louisiana" the following rules/statements will apply:

- a.) Applications of this type which are multi-institutional, but not multidisciplinary, must be submitted under the appropriate eligible discipline.
- b.) Applications of this type which are multidisciplinary, and which may or may not be multi-institutional, must be submitted under the classification "special multidisciplinary" and must be identified as such on the proposal's electronic cover sheet. **NOTE: MULTIDISCIPLINARY PROPOSALS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR SUBMISSION ONLY UNDER THE TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM.**
- c.) All multidisciplinary applications will be reviewed by a separate multidisciplinary panel composed of individuals with a broad range of expertise. \$950,000 has been allocated for awards in this category in FY 2009-10.
- d.) The category "special multidisciplinary" should in no way be construed as a relaxing of the Board's belief in the concept of rotating eligibility of disciplines. **Proposals submitted within the "special multidisciplinary" category must include at least ONE of the disciplines eligible in this funding cycle. This discipline must be checked on the proposal's cover sheet.**
- e.) The cover sheet of multi-institutional proposals must be signed by appropriate institutional officials from each participating institution. Separate pages may be used.

NOTE: Applicants who are considering submitting into this special category may wish to discuss their proposal with a member of the Board of Regents Support Fund Program staff prior to submittal.

3. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:** Any activity is eligible as long as the applicant can argue convincingly that it will enhance the infrastructure of the particular academic, research, or agricultural department or unit involved.
4. **ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS:** The same (or a very similar) proposal may not be submitted for funding consideration in the Undergraduate Enhancement, Traditional Enhancement, and the Two-Year Enhancement Programs.
5. **ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES:** In June of 1988, the Board of Regents adopted a ten-year Strategic Plan for Higher Education's Portion of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund, which was subsequently updated in 1993, 1999, and 2006. The 2006 Strategic Plan, sets forth the years in which certain disciplines are eligible to participate. Potential applicants should note that: (1) the **topic** of the proposal should be used to determine eligibility, not the academic training of the potential applicants; and (2) **eligible disciplines for FY 2009-10 through FY 2014-15 are as follows on the following page.**

TABLE I:

ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT*

GROUP I – ELIGIBLE FYs 2011-2012, 2014-15

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

GROUP II – ELIGIBLE FYs 2009-2010, 2012-2013

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

GROUP III – ELIGIBLE FYs 2010-2011, 2013-14

Business
Chemistry
Education
Mathematics
Physics/Astronomy

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

C. MONETARY LIMITATIONS

Except under extraordinary circumstances, applications for awards should be for no less than \$5,000 and no more than \$1 million each. Applicants should be aware, however, that the average total award in the FY 2008-09 competition was approximately \$84,962 in Traditional Enhancement, with first-year awards ranging from \$9,176 to \$282,872, and \$41,025 in Undergraduate Enhancement, with first-year awards ranging from \$5,102 to \$110,500.

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

D. DURATION

Multi-year proposals will be funded only in exceptional circumstances and only when substantial justification has been provided. When other criteria for evaluation are equal, preference will be given to one-year projects when awards are made.

E. FUNDS AVAILABLE

A total of \$32,116,788 is estimated to be available for the FY 2009-10 Board of Regents Support Fund budget for higher education.

1. **TRADITIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** Approximately \$3-4 million is anticipated to be available in FY 2009-10 for the first year's work of new Traditional Enhancement projects. The final amount of money that will be available is contingent on whether the Board of Regents is successful in leveraging additional Federal money from programs with complementary goals, as well as on interest rates and returns on equities. As indicated in Section III.B.2.c.4. above, \$950,000 of this amount is reserved for "special multidisciplinary" proposals.
2. **UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM:** For FY 2009-10, the Board has dedicated a maximum of \$1.62 million for the first-year's work of new Enhancement grants to be awarded to institutions and departments eligible under this subprogram. The final amount is contingent on interest rates and returns on equities.

F. COST SHARING AND MATCHING COMMITMENTS

The Board strongly encourages the sharing of costs for proposed projects through the acquisition of funds from external agencies and institutional support. The amount and nature of the institutional cost-sharing commitment are considered direct evidence of: (1) the institution's desire to see the project implemented; and (2) its commitment to the proposed project's ultimate success. As a result, the awarding of a grant is influenced, in some measure, by the amount and nature of the institutional commitment. Institutions should be aware that discounts received on equipment purchases are not considered as a match on the part of the institution. Equipment previously purchased cannot be considered as match. Potential applicants and university officials should note that institutional cost-sharing commitments are not taken lightly, either by the peer review panels of out-of-state experts who evaluate proposals, or by the Board which makes final funding decisions. For this reason, the Board of Regents strongly encourages institutions of higher education to make only those commitments that they can realistically meet.

NOTE: Matching commitments of any kind (e.g., private sector, federal, institutional) which are pledged in the proposal must be honored in the event that the proposal is funded. **Even if the proposal is funded at a reduced level, the full commitment may have to be honored.** Further, the required signature of the fiscal agent on the proposal cover page is a certification to the Board that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and/or statutes. Similarly, the fiscal agent's signature, which is required on the budget page(s) of funded projects, is a certification to the Board that commitments pledged in the proposal have been honored. All matching funds must meet the same tests of allowability as Support Fund money which is expended. No

Support Fund money will be forwarded until appropriate written documentation relative to these kinds of commitments has been received, reviewed, and approved by the Board's staff. (See Section V.B.6 "Budget and Budget Narrative" for additional information.)

G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE

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

Appropriate signatures on the cover page of the proposal are considered a guarantee that no conflict of interest exists and that the proposal: (1) has been reviewed and approved for submission to the Board by all appropriate institutional officials who regularly are required to review proposals submitted for external review, including the submitting organization's authorized fiscal officer; (2) has met the objectives, eligibility requirements, and all other appropriate criteria as set forth in this RFP (e.g., the department or unit is eligible to submit a proposal in that year); (3) is in the format required by the Board; and (4) where appropriate, has been reviewed by campus officials within a particular system where similar types of projects might be ongoing (e.g., the Director of the Agricultural Experimental Station and the Dean of the College of Agriculture).

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

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

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

I. FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED

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

J. DEBRIEFING

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

K. TIMETABLE

Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants will apply for FY 2009-10. **If deadline dates fall either on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday, the deadlines will be extended until 5:00 p.m. of the next working weekday.**

August, 2009	Request for proposals issued
October 1, 2009	Last day that applicants may ask questions about the RFP
October 24, 2009	Deadline for receipt of Traditional & Undergraduate Enhancement proposals in the Board's office (including all multidisciplinary proposals)
November, 2009 – March, 2010	Proposals reviewed by out-of-state experts
April, 2010	Reports and recommendations of out-of-state experts forwarded to institutions of higher education
April or May, 2010	Final actions by the Board; award letters forwarded to institutions
May and June, 2010	Contracts negotiated and executed

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

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

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

M. ELIGIBILITY OF CONTINUATION PROPOSALS

Submission of a proposal in a previous cycle does not mean that the applicant is relieved of the responsibility of submitting a full proposal if he or she wants the same, or a very similar proposal to be considered in the current funding cycle. Proposals that are resubmissions must compete on an equal basis with all other proposals. The applicant of continuation proposals must fully explain in the proposal narrative why he or she wishes to continue the project and summarize the progress to date. The applicant must also indicate on the cover page that the submission is a continuation request by indicating the contract number of the previous project so Board staff is aware that additional information is included with the continuation proposal. Failure to include the additional information could result in return of the proposal for noncompliance. **The Board discourages the submission of continuation requests in the Enhancement Program.**

IV. PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

The applicant is solely responsible for any reviewer misunderstandings that may occur because of missing information, or forms that are blank, or if the hard copy is incorrectly or inadequately fastened.

The directions for submitting all Enhancement Program proposals electronically (PDF format) will be available at <http://web.laregents.org/support> after October 1, 2009.

A. Number of Copies, Mailing Instructions, and Deadline Date:

One hard copy of the proposal **printed from the LOGAN submission** with original signatures and seven (7) copies must be submitted. All proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission. **The hard copies of the proposals must be printed from LOGAN. Other versions of the proposal are not acceptable.**

**AN ELECTRONIC COPY AND EIGHT (8) HARD COPIES OF PROPOSALS
MUST BE IN THE BOARD'S OFFICE BY 5:00 P.M., OCTOBER 24, 2009.**

NOTE: The official copy of the proposal is the online submission through LOGAN, not the hard copies. Should the hard copies of the proposal be different in any substantive fashion from the online submission, the proposal could be disqualified from the competition for non-compliance.

Mr. John Wallin

Associate Commissioner for Sponsored Programs Administration
Louisiana Board of Regents

U.S. Postal Service address:

P. O. Box 3677
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677

Street address for delivery services:

1201 North Third Street, Suite 6-200
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

After the applicant submits the completed proposal to his/her campus' Grants Office via LOGAN, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal will be e-mailed to the applicant's and to the campus' email addresses. Additionally, as soon as possible after the submission date, the applicant and the campus can check <http://web.laregents.org> for a summary of all Enhancement Program proposals submitted by the deadline date.

B. General Format:

The narrative section of the electronically submitted proposal is limited to 15 pages. The hard copy should be printed on one side of each page, put in the same sequence as the PDF version, and fastened securely.

If the applicant wants assurance that his/her proposal was received, check <http://web.laregents.org> after the submission date for a summary of all proposals received by the Program's deadline date.

V. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

The following requirements and format for Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement proposals must be followed closely. Proposals which do not adhere to these guidelines will be returned to the applicant for noncompliance and will not be considered for funding in the year of submission.

Each proposal must include the following information:

- A. **COVER PAGE**: Each item on the cover page must be completed. The electronic copy submitted via LOGAN will have an identification number assigned by LOGAN but will not have signatures, however, the original paper copy must be signed. If the proposal is a continuation request, the additional information must be provided in an electronic form that will appear when the continuation box is selected.
- B. **PROJECT SUMMARY**: The project summary, limited to 2,500 characters, should be a concise description of the project, containing a clear statement of goals and objectives and an outline indicating how the project will operate. The project summary should be informative to other individuals in the same field and should explain how the project meets the objectives of the Enhancement Program.
- C. **NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY**: Biographical sketches, budgets, and budget justifications are not considered part of the narrative section. The narrative should be succinct and avoid repetition. Information applicable in several places may be referenced by title of section. Should a section not apply to the project, the heading should be included, followed by "not applicable." Reviewers will assign points based on the quality and specificity of each section. The maximum number of points that can be assigned to each section is noted on the following pages. For multi-institutional proposals and/or multidisciplinary proposals that propose to share scarce State resources, as defined in section III.B.2.c of this RFP, as appropriate in each of the following sections, explain the multiple-campus agreement 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. Documentation must be provided describing the exact nature of the agreement between/among the institutions involved.
 1. **THE CURRENT SITUATION [total point value = 10]**

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

a. Institutional Description (no points)

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

b. Rationale for Project (5 points)

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

c. Impact on Existing Resources (5 points)

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

2. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN [total point value: equipment proposals = 52; non-equipment proposals = 62]

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

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

Define project goals and measurable objectives.

b. Work Plan of Proposed Project (equipment proposals = 15 points; non-equipment proposals = 20 points)

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

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

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

d. Impact on Curriculum and Instruction (5 points)

Explain the impact which the proposed project will have on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within the affected department(s) or unit(s). Appropriate to current thinking in the specific field(s) or discipline(s) of the proposed project, reform of undergraduate education and/or teacher preparation is encouraged.

e. Impact on Quality of Students (2 points)

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

f. Impact on Faculty Development (5 points)

Explain how the project will contribute to improving the quality and effectiveness of faculty teaching. Improvement of faculty pedagogical practices within the context of current thinking on reform of undergraduate education and teacher preparation, specific to field(s) or disciplines(s) of the proposed project is encouraged.

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

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

3. EQUIPMENT [For equipment proposals only, total point value = 10]

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

a. Equipment Request (6 points)

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

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

b. Equipment on Hand for Project (1 point)

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

c. Equipment Housing and Maintenance (3 points)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Explain the manner in which the project will assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthening an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency). Also, explain the manner in which funding of the proposed project will enhance prospects of additional external sources of funding.

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

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

6. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES (4 points)

If costs for the project will be shared through contributions from external organizations, describe and provide documentation of the commitment of the external agencies. Institutions are not allowed to claim the discount received for the purchase of equipment as either an external contribution or an institutional match.

D. PREVIOUS BoR SUPPORT FUND AWARDS

If either the prospective Project Director or Co-Project Director has received support from any Support Fund Program during the previous nine (9) years, the proposal must describe the earlier project(s) and outcomes in sufficient detail to permit a reviewer to reach an informed conclusion regarding the value of the results achieved. The following information must be included in this summary statement: (1) Project Director's name, amount of award, and period of support; (2) title of the project; (3) a summary of the results of the completed work; and (4) an explanation of the manner in which the current proposal is related to the previous award.

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

1. An itemized budget must be submitted on the electronic form provided in LOGAN. When a number is entered into the budget form, a separate box will appear into which the applicant will explain the item(s) to be included in that budgetary line item. This form is considered the budget narrative section. It should fully explain every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds and institutional/private match monies is requested. All funds for which a commitment from an external source has been pledged and which are cited in the narrative section of the proposal must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget narrative. Matching funds should be specified as "in cash" or "in kind."

2. Use State contract prices for equipment purchases where applicable. If having funds available after the proposed Support Fund award terminates is essential to the long-term success or feasibility of the project (e.g., equipment purchased with Support Fund money requires a continuing source of funds for operation and maintenance after a Support Fund award has terminated), the applicant must also provide a "Future Funding Plan" in the budget justification for the equipment purchases.

F. DISALLOWED BUDGETARY ITEMS

Support Fund monies cannot be used for ongoing operational costs of existing or proposed programs, entities, or projects. As indicated in Section I.B of this RFP, "Purposes of the Board of Regents Support Fund," Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution stipulates that "The monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education . . ." Applicants must make a case in their proposals that what they are proposing does not violate this stipulation. Applicants should also be aware that Support Fund Program staff will make 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.

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

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

While requests may be made to fund a continuing faculty or staff position (for a maximum of two years), such requests require substantial justification and a firm commitment from the submitting institution to continue the position after the award period ends. 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; or finally, funds may not be requested for anticipated centers or institutes which require Board approval prior to their establishment and which have not been approved by the Board of Regents prior to submission of the proposal.

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

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

G. FUNDS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL

Except in compelling and unusual circumstances, BoRSF support may not be requested for faculty release time. If the project director feels strongly that such an expenditure is warranted, partial salary support may be requested, but for each employee may not exceed 25% of academic-year salary plus two months of summer support. Salary support may be provided only as release time; full-time faculty and staff may not

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

- H. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Provide information necessary for reviewers to evaluate the capabilities and experience of key personnel. The "Biographical Sketch" form must be completed for the Project Director and all senior personnel. With respect to publications, biographical sketches should only include relevant books, peer-reviewed publications, and manuscripts formally accepted for publication. Works in progress and those submitted for publication should not be included.
- I. CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT:** Complete the Support Fund form for the Project Director and all Co-directors. Technicians and visiting scholars do not need to complete this form.
- J. PROJECT ACTIVATION DATE AND ANTICIPATED DATE OF COMPLETION:**
The project activation date is June 1, 2010 and the termination date is June 30, 2011 for one-year projects or June 30, 2011 for two-year projects.

(enhRFP09.10 JH:desktop, Rev. 9/2009)

APPENDIX A

TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES FOR THE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

APPENDIX A

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

NATURAL SCIENCES - BIOLOGICAL

Agriculture

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

Biological Sciences

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

NATURAL SCIENCES -BIOLOGICAL (CONTINUED)

Health and Medical Sciences

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

NATURAL SCIENCES - PHYSICAL

Chemistry

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

Physics and Astronomy

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

NATURAL SCIENCES - COMPUTATIONAL

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

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

NATURAL SCIENCES - EARTH/ENVIRONMENTAL

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

ENGINEERING - A

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

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

ENGINEERING - A (CONTINUED)

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

ENGINEERING - B

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

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

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

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

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Anthropology and Archaeology
1701 Anthropology
1702 Archaeology

Economics
1801 Economics
1802 Econometrics

Law (5102)

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

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

Sociology and Social Work
2101 Demography
2102 Sociology
5001 Social Work

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

SOCIAL SCIENCES (CONTINUED)

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

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

Library and Archival Sciences
4701 Library Science
4702 Archival Science

ARTS

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

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

Arts - Other
2999A Arts - Other
5101A Interdisciplinary Programs

HUMANITIES

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

HUMANITIES (CONTINUED)

Foreign Language and Literature

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

History

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

Philosophy

- 2801 All Philosophy Fields

Humanities - Other

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

EDUCATION

Education - Administration

- 3001 Educational Administration
- 3002 Educational Supervision

Education - Curriculum and Instruction

- 3101 Curriculum and Instruction

Education - Early Childhood

- 3201 Early Childhood Education

Education - Elementary

- 3301 Elementary Education
- 3302 Elementary-level Teaching Fields

EDUCATION (CONTINUED)

Education-Evaluation and Research

- 3401 Educational Statistics and Research

- 3402 Educational Testing Evaluation and Measurement
- 3403 Educational Psychology
- 3404 Elementary and Secondary Research

- 3405 Higher Education Research

Education - Higher

- 3501 Educational Policy
- 3502 Higher Education

Education - Secondary

- 3601 Secondary Education
- 3602 Secondary Level Teaching Fields

Education - Special

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

Education - Student Counseling & Personnel Services

- 3801 Personnel Services
- 3802 Student Counseling

Education - Other

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

BUSINESS

Accounting

4001 Accounting

4002 Taxation

Banking and Finance

4101 Commercial Banking

4102 Finance

4103 Investments and Securities

Business, Administration and Management

4201 Business Administration and
Management

4202 Human Resource Development

4203 Institutional Management

4204 Labor/Industrial Relations

4205 Management Science

4206 Organizational Behavior

4207 Personnel Management

4299 Business Management - Other

Business - Other

4301 Business Economics

4302 International Business Management

4303 Management Information Systems

4304 Marketing and Distribution

4305 Marketing Management and Research

4399 Business Fields - Other

(2008)

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS

Form 6.11

Evaluation Form for Enhancement Proposals
Primarily Requesting Equipment

Form 6.12

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10

RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
PURCHASE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- YES _____ NO _____ A.1 Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.2 To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)?
- _____ of 5 pts. A.3 To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)?

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 52 points

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

COMMENTS:

C. EQUIPMENT--Total of 10 points

- _____ of 6 pts. C.1 To what extent has the proposal established a relationship between the enhancement plan and the items of equipment requested? Is the equipment well-justified? Will it significantly enhance the existing technological capability of the department? Does it reflect current and projected trends in technology?
- _____ of 1 pt. C.2 Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?
- _____ of 3 pts. C.3 To what extent does the proposal present a reasonable plan to ensure a maximum usable lifetime for the equipment? Are housing and maintenance arrangements for equipment adequate?

COMMENTS:

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

- _____ of 12 pts D.1 Are the faculty and support personnel appropriately qualified to implement this project? If special training will be required for faculty and/or other personnel, has an appropriate plan been developed?

COMMENTS:

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

- _____ of 2 pts. E.1 To what extent will the project assist in establishing a new relationship, or strengthen an existing relationship, with one or more industrial/institutional sponsors (e.g., private business, trade organization, professional organization, non-profit or community organization, another university or consortium of universities, federal government agency)?

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

- _____ of 10 pts. E.2a For science/engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project assist the submitting department(s)/unit(s) in promoting or enhancing the economic development of the State of Louisiana?
- E.2b For non-science/non-engineering proposals only: To what extent will the project contribute to the academic and/or cultural resources of the State of Louisiana?

COMMENTS:

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

F. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts. F.1 To what extent will the costs associated with this project be shared through contributions from the institution(s) involved and/or external organizations?

COMMENTS:

G. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount \$ _____

Recommended Amount \$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====
I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 2009-10
RATING FORM FOR TRADITIONAL AND UNDERGRADUATE ENHANCEMENT PROPOSALS
REQUESTS OTHER THAN EQUIPMENT PURCHASES (e.g., Colloquia, Curricular Revisions, etc.)**

INSTRUCTIONS: The completed evaluation form should represent the consensus of the expert members of the review panel and, as such, must reflect the final decisions of that panel. Review this form and the program guidelines prior to reading the proposal. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Guidelines should not be interpreted to exclude from eligibility departments and/or units engaged solely in instruction. Use the white space provided to explain the panel's ratings, especially on items given low scores. Attach additional pages, as necessary.

A. THE CURRENT SITUATION--Total of 10 points

- | | | |
|--------------------|-----|--|
| YES _____ NO _____ | A.1 | Has the applicant adequately described the institution and unit(s)/department(s) that will benefit from the proposed project, especially in terms of mission, faculty, students, and relevant institutional or departmental resources? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.2 | To what extent will the proposed project enhance the affected department(s) or unit(s)? |
| _____ of 5 pts. | A.3 | To what extent will the project complement and improve upon existing resources of the department(s) or unit(s)? |

COMMENTS:

B. THE ENHANCEMENT PLAN--Total of 62 points

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

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

No Points Given,
But this is a required
component

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 12 pts

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 2 pts.

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

NOTE TO REVIEWER:

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

_____ of 10 pts.

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

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

COMMENTS:

E. ADDITIONAL FUNDING SOURCES--Total of 4 points

_____ of 4 pts.

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

COMMENTS:

F. PREVIOUS SUPPORT FUND AWARDS--No points assigned

YES__ NO__

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

COMMENTS:

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

_____ of 100 points

Proposal Number: _____

Principal Investigator: _____

SPECIFIC BUDGETARY RECOMMENDATIONS

Requested Amount:\$ _____ Recommended Amount:\$ _____

COMMENTS:

=====

I agree to maintain in confidence any information, documentation and material of any kind (hereinafter referred to as "Material") included in this proposal; I further agree not to disclose, divulge, publish, file patent application on, claim ownership of, exploit or make any other use whatsoever of said "Material" without the written permission of the principal investigator. To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my reviewing this proposal.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: _____

Reviewer's Signature: _____ Date: _____