

**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND**  
**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2013-14**

**Request for Proposals, Number 2013-08**

**Guidelines for the Submission of**  
**Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS) Proposals**  
**and**  
**Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS) Proposals**

**(This RFP excludes the R&D Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars [ATLAS] Program. The ATLAS RFP is Number 2013-10.)**

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<http://web.laregents.org>

(Revised 7-2013)

# REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS, NUMBER 2013-08

## Important Notices

### **Electronic Submission of Notices of Intent and Proposals**

This is the third cycle in which RCS and ITRS Program 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 <http://web.laregents.org/support>. For help with electronic submission, please email [support@laregents.org](mailto: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, 2013, 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, 2013 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: <http://web.laregents.org> under Downloads -"RFPs, Policies and Forms."

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| <b>I. General Information</b>   | 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           |
| <b>II. Types of R &amp; D Subprograms</b>   | 1           |
| <b>III. The Research Competitiveness and Industrial Ties Research Subprograms</b>   | 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  | 5           |
| 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  | 6           |
| J. Debriefing   | 6           |
| K. Timetable  | 6           |
| L. Evaluation of Funded Projects and Reports Required   | 7           |
| M. Previous Submissions and Requests for Continuation Funding   | 7           |
| 1. Requirements for Previous Applicants   | 7           |
| 2. Requests for Continuation Funding  | 7           |
| <b>IV. Procedure and Deadline for Submission of Notices of Intent</b>   | 7           |
| <b>V. Procedure and Deadline for Submission of Proposals</b>  | 8           |
| <b>VI. Proposal Requirements and Format</b>   | 8           |
| A. General Requirements and Stipulations  | 8           |
| 1. Limitation on Number of Research Proposals That May Be Submitted   | 8           |
| 2. Submission Requirements  | 8           |
| 3. Addenda Submitted Before or After Receipt of Proposal  | 8           |
| 4. General Format Stipulations  | 8           |
| 5. Guidelines for Identifying, Labeling and Certifying the<br>Confidential Nature of Information Contained in Research Proposals                | 8           |
| 6. Guidelines for Proposals Involving the Use of Human Subjects or Vertebrate Animals   | 9           |
| B. Specific Requirements and Format   | 9           |
| 1. Cover Page   | 9           |
| 2. Project Summary  | 9           |
| 3. Goals and Objectives   | 9           |
| 4. Narrative and Bibliography   | 9           |
| 5. Budget and Budget Narrative  | 11          |
| 6. Current and Pending Support/History of Support   | 13          |
| 7. Biographical Sketch  | 13          |
| 8. Proposal Appendix  | 13          |
| <b>Appendix A:</b> Taxonomy of Disciplines for the R&D Program /Board of Regents Industrial Targets Advisory Committee Target Areas<br>for ITRS |             |
| <b>Appendix B:</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 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.

### **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' “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. 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](mailto:zenovia.simmons@la.gov)) at (225) 342-4253. In compliance with R. S. 39:1503, questions will be accepted and answered until October 15, 2013 (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, <http://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 components: the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS), the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS), 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 in which they are submitted; (2) several sets of criteria have been established to evaluate these proposals; and (3) the ATLAS program is administered under a separate RFP, available on the Sponsored Programs website. See screening and in-depth evaluation forms for research proposals in Appendix C for the criteria that will be used to evaluate proposals submitted in each subprogram.

### III. THE RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS AND INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAMS

#### 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.

Applications from Non-Tenure-Track Faculty: Because the guiding principle governing the Support Fund programs is to support activities which will have a positive long-term impact on the State's economic and educational base, when other criteria are equal, those applications from investigators who have been hired by an institution to fill a tenure-track position are regarded by reviewers in a more favorable light than applications submitted by post-docs, research staff, or instructors. For this reason, faculty who hold part-time, research, or other non-tenure track faculty positions are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of their institution's long-term interest in their research efforts.

##### **Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS)**

The specific objective of the ITRS is to fund research proposals with significant near-term potential for development and diversification of Louisiana's economic base. Accordingly, all proposals submitted in this subprogram should show evidence of involvement of the private sector. Applicants who anticipate submitting proposals in non-science or non-engineering areas should see the note at the end of this section.

The ITRS is also a stimulus program. To be funded, proposals must provide evidence that the project will: (1) involve significant private-sector or Federal funding or, at a minimum, develop a plan to greatly increase the likelihood of receiving Federal or private-sector funding in the near future; or (2) result potentially in the enhancement or establishment of a Louisiana business or industry which will attract significant revenues to the State. All faculty at Louisiana institutions of higher education, including senior researchers, who have research ideas that might promote significant near-term economic development in Louisiana are encouraged to apply.

**NOTE:** In the case of proposals in non-science and non-engineering areas (e.g., tourism), private-sector involvement is not necessarily a requirement, if the applicant can justify the reason for lack of involvement. The stimulus/leveraging concept is relevant, however, and non-science/non-engineering proposals must, at a minimum: (1) present a plan to leverage Support Fund monies in the manner most appropriate to the proposal; and (2) demonstrate how the project will promote and/or enhance economic development in the State.

#### B. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only those individuals employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. **An eligible faculty member may serve as a principal or co-principal investigator on a maximum of one RCS and two ITRS grants at any one time.** 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 other investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal. Section III.A of this RFP provides more information on the type of researcher targeted in each of the Support Fund R & D subprograms.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:** The Board's Policy for Administration stipulates 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:** The Board's Policy for Administration further stipulates that "Both basic and applied research proposals that have the potential for contributing to the State's economic development 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:**
  - a. **Research Competitiveness Subprogram:** 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 2007. Table I, which is a part of the 2007 Strategic Plan, sets forth the years in which certain disciplines are eligible to participate. Potential applicants should note that: (1) the topic of the research proposal should be used to determine eligibility, not the academic training of the potential applicants; and (2) eligible disciplines for FY 2013-14 are listed under **GROUPS I and III**.

---

**TABLE I: ELIGIBLE DISCIPLINES\***  
**BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS SUBPROGRAM**

---

**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 2010-11, 2011-12, 2014-15, 2015-16**

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.

\*\*The frequency of eligibility for "Computer and Information Sciences" was increased in the 1993 Strategic Plan to reflect the growing importance of this discipline for the State's economic development and diversification.

---

**IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ITRS APPLICANTS:**

- b. **Industrial Ties Research Subprogram:** The 1999 Strategic Plan states: ". . . Prior to 1993, proposal submissions were limited to those areas deemed to be of highest priority by the Louisiana Department of Economic Development. To insure that no viable opportunity for economic development and diversification would be overlooked, submissions were invited in all research areas from FY 1992-93 to FY 1999-2000. To align the Support Fund more closely with the State's emerging economic initiatives while also targeting scarce resources for maximum effect, a modified approach will be followed..... Beginning in FY 2000-2001, ITRS proposals will be accepted each year only from the areas identified by the BoR Industrial Targets Advisory Committee... ." That list is included at the end of 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 2012-13 was \$47,010, with first-year awards ranging from \$28,000 to \$64,908. 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.

**ITRS:** No applicant may seek more than \$350,000 over a three-year period. The total request for the first year may not exceed \$150,000, and the total request for each successive year may not exceed \$100,000. Applicants should be aware, however, that the average first-year ITRS award in FY 2012-13 was \$72,056, with first-year awards ranging from \$43,704 to \$90,000.

**D. PROJECT DURATION**

No applicant may seek more than three years of support under the R & D subprograms.

**E. FUNDS AVAILABLE**

The FY 2013-14 Support Fund Plan and Budget allocates \$865,000 to fund new awards in RCS and \$375,000 for new awards in ITRS. 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 submitting 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 R & D APPLICANTS

For all equipment requests under the R & D program, the applicant 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. For RCS proposals, a 25% equipment match must be provided by the applicant's employing institution. Review panels will have authority to recommend to the Board that any R & D application requesting funds for equipment, but lacking the required equipment match, be reduced or not funded.

### IMPORTANT NOTICE TO ITRS APPLICANTS

All ITRS applicants are required to have an "up front" matching commitment from the private/federal sector for at least the first year of the request. A plan to secure subsequent year matching commitments must be addressed in the budget section of the proposal. If all other criteria are equal, it is likely that those applicants with strong matching commitments will fare better than those lacking these commitments. Grants, awards, and "in-kind" contributions received prior to **June 1, 2013**, may not be applied toward any matching commitments required during the contract term. Additionally, applicants should be aware that inclusion of a private-sector entity as both an industrial partner and a paid consultant/subcontractor represents a potentially serious conflict of interest and is therefore discouraged. Should the participation of a private-sector entity in both roles be essential to conducting proposed research, the proposal must clearly and strongly justify this circumstance and submit a letter signed by the President/Chancellor of the submitting institution certifying that this vendor is the only provider for services to be supported with BoRSF funds. Lastly, any investigator listed in the proposal who has any financial affiliation with a private-sector supporter must fully disclose this affiliation and provide a certified letter signed by the institution verifying that no significant conflict of interest exists. Failure to report this information may result in disqualification of the proposal.

### **G. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE**

The Board's Policy for Administration requires that proposals 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 subprogram in which it was submitted 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**

The Board's Policy on Administration stipulates that "(Research) proposals forwarded to the Board of Regents 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.

A separate review is conducted for each of the R & D subprograms; however, the review process for both subprograms usually involves at least two stages:

#### 1. Mail and Subject-Area Reviews

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.)

#### 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.



In the case of the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram, the final panel may also consider certain information provided by economic development experts at the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (LED). These experts will be asked: (1) to review certain portions of each proposal included in the mail review (the project summary and the information included in section VI.B.5.a, "Rationale of Project," of this RFP); and (2) to comment on the extent to which proposals appear to have significant potential for the development and/or diversification of Louisiana's economy. Applicants should note that the information provided by LED is simply another piece of information that the final panel may or may not use in arriving at its decisions. Individuals from LED do not convene with the final panel, nor are they involved in recommending projects for funding. Even though LED may believe a project has high potential for economic development and/or diversification, the final panel is directed to disregard that information if it believes either that the project: (1) is not scientifically meritorious and technically feasible and sound; and/or (2) does not appear to have significant potential for economic development and/or diversification.

Because of administrative and budgetary constraints placed on the Board's staff, applicants should be aware that, if an exceedingly large number of applications is received, the Board reserves the right, through a preliminary screening by out-of-state experts, to determine which proposals are eligible to participate in the mail review. In this event, these out-of-state experts will assess whether each proposal fulfills the objectives and guidelines of the subprogram under which it was submitted. (See Appendix B for sample screening forms.) Proposals which receive average screening scores in the range of 70-100 will be reviewed by mail. Proposals which receive an average screening score of less than 70 will be eliminated from the competition.

**NOTE:** In light of matching requirements instituted in this RFP (i.e., a 25% of cost minimum cash match for all R & D equipment requests and an "up-front" private-sector and/or federal match for ITRS proposals), R & D 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 affected applicants in late July 2014.

#### **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 2013-14. **If the following date(s) falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadline(s) will be extended until 4:30 P.M. of the next working weekday:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| July 2013                              | Request for Proposals Issued  |
| September 11, 2013, 4:30 p.m., Central | Notices of Intent Due through LOGAN   |
| October 15, 2013, 4:30 p.m., Central   | Last Day that Potential Applicants May Ask Questions About the RFP                                |
| October 31, 2013, 4:30 p.m., Central   | Deadline for Receipt of ITRS Proposals through LOGAN  |
| November 7, 2013, 4:30 p.m., Central   | Deadline for Receipt of RCS Proposals through LOGAN   |
| November 2013 – March 2014             | Proposals Transmitted to and Reviewed by Out-of-State Experts                                     |
| April 2014                             | Reports and Recommendations of Out-of-State Experts Forwarded to Institutions of Higher Education |
| April 2014                             | Final Action by the Board   |
| May – June 2014                        | Contracts Negotiated and Executed   |
| July 2014                              | Dissemination of Debriefing Information   |

#### **L. 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 these 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 consultants may be utilized in the evaluation process."

Periodically, the Board of Regents will 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 AND REQUESTS FOR CONTINUATION FUNDING**

1. REQUIREMENTS FOR PREVIOUS APPLICANTS: Submission of a notice of intent and a research proposal in a previous funding cycle does not relieve the applicant of the requirements 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.
2. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUATION FUNDING: Except for those principal investigators whose projects are currently being funded and to whom multi-year research contracts have been awarded, all principal investigators who received funding in the past for a particular research project and who want to continue that same project or a very similar project must submit another notice of intent and full proposal in the fiscal year in which they desire continuation funding. If the continuation request is for a project which has been completed, a copy of the final report must be included in the appendices. If the continuation request is for a project which is ongoing, the research proposal must contain a separate section which describes progress to date.

All continuation requests must compete on a one-to-one basis with all other projects submitted for funding consideration in the year in which the continuation request is submitted. If the proposal survives the screening process, out-of-state experts participating in the review panels will be told to base their funding recommendation on their evaluations of both the new proposal and the information concerning past progress, whether it be the final report provided by the principal investigator or a progress and financial status report provided by the Support Fund R & D Program staff. In addition, applicants who have received support through the RCS in the past should note that, because the RCS targets those researchers who show strong promise of becoming competitive for federal R & D money in three years or less, any request for continuation support must include a convincing explanation as to why the investigator is not yet competitive and must demonstrate how additional support will solve this problem.

#### **IV. PROCEDURE AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF NOTICES OF INTENT**

Before a full proposal will be accepted, the applicant must first submit a completed notice of intent form for each research proposal to be submitted. The notice of intent must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m., September 11, 2013. 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 telephone numbers and 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 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 per subprogram, etc.) also hold true for notices of intent.

## V. PROCEDURE AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Full proposals must be submitted via LOGAN to the Board of Regents by 4:30 p.m. on the due date set forth for the particular subprogram under which the application is being submitted, as listed in section "III.K. Timetable" of this RFP. The applicant will be notified via email that the electronic submission was received through LOGAN. A second email will indicate whether the proposal is in compliance with Board regulations and accepted for review.

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

## VI. 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 not be accepted 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 and two research proposals in the ITRS, with the applicant listed as "Principal or Co-Principal Investigator"; however, the same proposal may not be submitted under both subprograms. An applicant may be listed as "Other Investigator" on additional proposals in either subprogram.
2. **SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:** The NOI and proposal must be submitted via LOGAN. The LOGAN submission system may be accessed at <http://web.laregents.org> by clicking LOGAN on the menu at the top of the page.
3. **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.
4. **GENERAL FORMAT STIPULATIONS:** The proposal must be entered in the LOGAN submission system according to instructions.
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 VI.A.5.b.ii.

- c. The information to be protected and the letter described in VI.A.5.a. and VI.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. 2131et 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 narrative and bibliography (see VI.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 <http://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, as well as 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 fifteen (15) single-spaced pages with a type size of 12 point or greater. 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:** The fifteen (15) page narrative limit does not include the bibliography. The bibliography shall not exceed two (2) pages.

**a. Rationale of the Project**

RCS Proposals Must Include:

- i. Assessment of potential for achieving national competitiveness, including current status and identification of barriers to achieving competitiveness.
- ii. A plan for achieving national competitiveness, including the specific strategies, actions, methods, and additional resources proposed to accomplish the stated goals.
- iii. If available, critiques of proposals submitted to Federal funding agencies (or other funding sources) should be appended to the proposal 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).

ITRS Proposals Must Include:

- i. A description of the relationship of the proposed research to significant near-term economic development and/or diversification in Louisiana, including a description of the target economic sector for which the research is proposed; potential for the proposed research to remedy problems identified in this economic sector; the manner in which the results will foster economic development or diversification (e.g., the transfer of research results, private-sector/industrial linkages, etc.); and the potential impact of the research if successful (e.g., the research has a broad national/international market, would create new jobs, would allow for the stabilization of an existing industry, etc.).
- ii. A detailed description of private-sector/industrial participation in the project, including past, scheduled, and potential scheduled or potential contacts with industry or the private sector. Contributions of funds, equipment, and services by the private sector on a past, scheduled, or potential basis must also be described in detail.
- iii. Identification of an existing industry that will utilize proposal results or of a new industry that will be created as a result of the proposed research.

In the case of non-science and non-engineering disciplines (e.g., tourism), the rationale should include a description of how the proposed research will enhance/promote economic development in the State. It is understood that the impact of the proposal may be direct or subtle, depending on its focus; however, to the extent feasible, applicants should respond to the items described in this section.

**NOTE:** The information provided in response to this section of the RFP (VI.B.4.a) must also be provided with the abstract of all ITRS proposals, either as an integral part of the abstract itself or as an attachment.

**b. Research Plan**

Both RCS and ITRS 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, 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 your project has been a success and the degree to which it has achieved its goals.

RCS Proposals Must Also:

- 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 RCS funding ends.

ITRS Proposals Must Also:

- iv. Include projected mechanisms to transfer results of research to economic development or diversification. Additionally, where appropriate, a technology transfer certification describing the specific actions that have been taken to protect intellectual property and license the technology must be included. The certification must also indicate any spin-off companies that have been formed as a result of the project. This certification should be provided by the technology transfer officer or other appropriate administrative officers of the institution of higher education.

**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. In particular, Research Competitiveness Subprogram 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 included.

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**

5. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE: (Also see Section III.F of the RFP relative to 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 Support Fund money requested for successive years of a research project should decrease either as researchers become consistently competitive in obtaining Federal funding in the case of the Research Competitiveness Subprogram, or as they are able to secure private-sector funding in the case of the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram.

**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 from an external source and which are cited in the text of the application must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget justification section. This is especially crucial for applications submitted into the ITRS for which industrial/private-sector support is an important consideration in funding decisions.

**b. Project Activation Date and Anticipated Date of Completion**

The project activation date is June 1, 2014, 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. 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 RCS 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 RCS 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. These expenditures (e.g., paying honoraria to faculty) are not allowable because the 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 and Support Personnel**

Principal Investigator(s) may request partial salary support at an annual amount not to exceed 25% academic year salary plus two months' summer support. **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 assistantships, 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 2013-14) for principal and co-principal investigators and support personnel requesting salary support must be stated in the proposal.** 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. Institutions are 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.

Support Fund money may not be requested to pay fringe benefits for graduate assistants or graduate and undergraduate student workers. However, 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. (NOTE: For RCS proposals, a 25% equipment match 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. If such awards have been received, the applicant must either declare that this is a continuation proposal or explain thoroughly why this is not a continuation proposal and why it should not be required to conform to the requirements of Section III.M.2 of this RFP.

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. 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) the support of industry is required to conduct the research; and (2) 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.

**NOTE:** Letters of support indicating private-sector involvement are strongly encouraged for Industrial Ties Research Subprogram applicants.



## **APPENDIX A**

**TAXONOMY OF DISCIPLINES FOR THE R & D PROGRAM  
and  
BOARD OF REGENTS INDUSTRIAL TARGETS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
TARGET AREAS FOR ITRS**

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

(2013)

**BOARD OF REGENTS  
INDUSTRIAL TARGETS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**TARGET AREAS FOR ITRS**

- \* Medical and Biomedical
- \* Micromanufacturing
- \* Data and Telecommunications
- \* Environmental Technologies
- \* Food Technologies
- \* Materials
- \* Existing Principal Industries, such as petrochemicals and agribusiness
- \* Louisiana Culture and History

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORMS**

- Form 6.2: RCS Screening Form
- Form 6.3: RCS Mail Review Form
- Form 6.4: RCS Subject-Area Review Form
- Form 6.51: ITRS Screening Form (Science/Engineering Areas)
- Form 6.52: ITRS Screening Form (Non-Science/Non-Engineering Areas)
- Form 6.61: ITRS Mail Review Form (Science/Engineering Areas)
- Form 6.62: ITRS Mail Review Form (Non-Science/Non-Engineering Areas)



BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
SCREENING FORM FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS  
RESEARCH COMPETITIVENESS SUBPROGRAM, FY 2013-14

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Area: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE NOTE: The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.  
ONLY THOSE PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVE AVERAGE SCORES OF 70 AND ABOVE WILL BE CONSIDERED FURTHER.

**CRITERION I: STIMULUS TO COMPETITIVE RESEARCH (40 points)**

1. The investigator clearly identifies barriers to achieving nationally competitive status in sponsored research. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
2. The proposal includes a realistic plan to eliminate or reduce barriers to nationally competitive research. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
3. The above plan will significantly improve the ability of the researcher(s) to compete nationally within three years. \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 points

**CRITERION II: RELEVANCE TO FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH (35 points)**

1. The proposal seeks to develop fundamental knowledge, not simply apply it. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
2. This is an important area of contemporary or future research to:  
NSF \_\_\_\_ NIH \_\_\_\_ Defense \_\_\_\_ Energy \_\_\_\_ Agriculture \_\_\_\_ Interior \_\_\_\_  
NOAA \_\_\_\_ NASA \_\_\_\_ Education \_\_\_\_ Other (name) \_\_\_\_\_ None \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
3. The proposed research will provide an effective foundation on which the individual or department can build a successful program. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points

**CRITERION III: POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS (25 points)**

1. The record of research accomplishments (some funding and publications) suggests strong potential for achieving a competitive status in acquiring Federal funding for fundamental research. List any participating investigators who either lack the potential to achieve national competitiveness or are already competitive: \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points

**TOTAL POINTS: \_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points**

**OVERALL RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING FURTHER REVIEW OF THIS PROPOSAL (CHECK):**

\_\_\_\_\_ Proposal clearly demonstrates strong potential for enhancing competitive status in the Federal R & D marketplace within a three-year time span and certainly should be subjected to further in-depth review.

\_\_\_\_\_ As submitted, proposal should not be reviewed further 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.

To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my screening this research proposal.

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
PLEASE PLACE COMMENTS ON BACK OF FORM

(Form 6.2, rev. 2013)

**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.<br>List any investigators who either:<br>(a) lack the potential to achieve national competitiveness _____<br>or<br>(b) are already competitive _____ | 1 2 3 4 5      |
| 2. The likelihood and volume of federal funding for research in the field of the application is high.<br>Identify agencies which would be interested in this area of research: (e.g., NSF) _____<br>_____  | 1 2 3 4 5      |
| 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 <u>foundation</u> 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 10 points
- 2. Adequacy of institutional capabilities as base for building competitiveness \_\_ of 5 points
- 3. Training, past performance, and potential of investigators \_\_ of 10 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 10 points
- 2. Likelihood of new discoveries or fundamental advances within field \_\_ of 10 points
- 3. Impact on progress in this or other fields \_\_ of 5 points
- 4. Contribution to basic science \_\_ of 5 points
- 5. Utility or relevance of research to improved technology or society \_\_ of 5 points
- 6. Potential for contribution to quality or effectiveness of U.S. research \_\_ of 5 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: \_\_\_\_\_



BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
SCREENING FORM FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS, INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM  
FY 2013-14  
Science/Engineering Target Areas

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Area: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE NOTE: The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. ONLY THOSE PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVE AVERAGE SCORES OF 70 AND ABOVE WILL BE CONSIDERED FURTHER.

**CRITERION I: CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (45 points)**

1. At a national/international level research such as proposed is contributing or has the potential to contribute to economic development and diversification \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
2. The proposal offers the strong prospect of attracting private-sector or Federal research funds from: Private Sector \_\_\_\_ NSF \_\_\_\_ NIH \_\_\_\_ Defense \_\_\_\_ Energy \_\_\_\_ Agriculture \_\_\_\_ Interior \_\_\_\_ NOAA \_\_\_\_ NASA \_\_\_\_ Education \_\_\_\_ Other (name) \_\_\_\_\_ None \_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
3. The potential economic benefits of the research would be realized in the near term. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points

**CRITERION II: RESEARCH INNOVATION (30 points)**

1. The proposed research shows significant innovation. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
2. The proposed research would advance the state of the art of science, engineering, or technology, not simply transfer existing technology. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points

**CRITERION III: POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS (25 points)**

1. The qualifications and accomplishments of the investigators suggest high potential for success. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
2. Institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points

**TOTAL POINTS: \_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points**

OVERALL RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING FURTHER REVIEW OF THIS PROPOSAL (CHECK)

\_\_\_\_\_ Proposal clearly demonstrates strong potential for enhancing or promoting the development or diversification of Louisiana's economic base in the near future and certainly should be reviewed in-depth.

\_\_\_\_\_ As submitted, proposal should not be reviewed further because:

\_\_\_\_\_ It is inappropriate to the program.

\_\_\_\_\_ Although the research may have merit, the proposal does not offer realistic prospects for contributing to economic development and/or diversification.

\_\_\_\_\_ The research may have some potential for contributing to economic development and diversification; however, as currently conceived and written, it does not appear to demonstrate significant potential for enhancing or promoting the development or diversification of Louisiana's economic base in the near future.

To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my screening this research proposal.

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE PLACE COMMENTS ON BACK OF FORM

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
SCREENING FORM FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS, INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM  
FY 2013-14  
Non-Science/Non-Engineering Target Areas

Proposal Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Subject Area: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE NOTE: The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration.  
ONLY THOSE PROPOSALS THAT RECEIVE AVERAGE SCORES OF 70 AND ABOVE WILL BE CONSIDERED FURTHER.

**CRITERION I: SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT AND CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (35 points)**

1. Extent to which the proposed research will have a broad positive impact on State/National academic and/or cultural resources. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
2. Extent to which the proposed research addresses an important problem or need and represents an improvement upon, or a valid departure from, existing practice. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
3. Value of expected contribution to economic development in Louisiana. \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points

**CRITERION II: RESEARCH INNOVATION AND ACADEMIC/INTELLECTUAL RIGOR (35 points)**

1. Extent to which the proposed research shows significant innovation. \_\_\_\_\_ of 20 points
2. Extent to which the proposed research would advance the state of the art of State/National academic and/or cultural resources. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points

**CRITERION III: POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS (30 points)**

1. Extent to which the qualifications and accomplishments of the investigators suggest high potential for success. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points
2. Extent to which institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success. \_\_\_\_\_ of 15 points

**TOTAL POINTS: \_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points**

**OVERALL RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING FURTHER REVIEW OF THIS PROPOSAL (CHECK)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Proposal clearly demonstrates strong potential for positively impacting State/National academic and/or cultural resources and will enhance or promote economic development in Louisiana.
- \_\_\_\_\_ As submitted, proposal should not be reviewed further because:
- \_\_\_\_\_ It is inappropriate to the program.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Although the research may have merit, the proposal, as currently written, will not have a broad positive impact on State/National Academic or cultural resources.
- \_\_\_\_\_ The applicant has not made a convincing argument that the proposed research is meritorious/will make a timely contribution to its field/will enhance economic development in the State.

To the best of my knowledge, no conflict of interest is created as a result of my screening this research proposal.

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

PLEASE PLACE COMMENTS ON BACK OF FORM

OUT-OF-STATE MAIL REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM  
**DUE DATE:**  
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM (ITRS)  
Science/Engineering Target Areas

PLEASE NOTE: This critique will be used, along with other assessments, to determine whether a proposal merits funding. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Please place qualitative comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

**A. RESEARCH INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RIGOR (Using national standards of excellence)**

- 1. Extent to which proposal shows innovation and potential to advance the state of the art in science, engineering, or technology            of 15 points
- 2. Extent to which the procedures and research methods are clear, appropriate and realistic within the amount of time proposed            of 10 points
- 3. Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined and can be accomplished by the proposed approach            of 10 points

**SUBTOTAL A:**            of 35 points

COMMENTS:

**B. CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- 1. Evaluation of the expected economic impact of the proposed study in general            of 5 points
- 2. Evaluation of the expected economic impact of the proposed study to the Louisiana economy            of 5 points
- 3. Does the project have significant potential for:  
NOTE: Answer either "a" or "b." If proposal accomplishes both "a" and "b", reduce point value for each category to four, rate all four categories, and provide comments.
  - a. The establishment of a new business or industry
    - i. Evaluation of the potential for commercial use of research results within the Louisiana economy            of 8 points
    - ii. Extent to which technology-based business would be interested in the project            of 8 points
  - b. The enhancement of existing business or industry
    - i. Evaluation of the extent to which the proposed project would establish a new relationship between the researchers and one or more corporate sponsors (rather than simply reinforce--or subsidize--an existing relationship)            of 8 points
    - ii. Evaluation of the extent to which the project is part of a coherent plan for expanding university R & D activities in this area over a multi-year period            of 8 points

- 4. Extent to which the principal investigator has demonstrated private-sector involvement and/or support            of 4 points

**SUBTOTAL B:**            of 30 points

COMMENTS:

**C. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS**

- 1. Training, past performance, and potential of the investigators \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
- 2. Extent to which institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success \_\_\_\_\_ of 10 points
- 3. Extent to which the personnel have been appropriately assigned to specific tasks \_\_\_\_\_ of 5 points

**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:**

**TOTAL SCORE (A through D):** \_\_\_\_\_ of 100 points

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**OVERALL RATING OF PROPOSAL**

Poor    Fair    Good    Very Good    Excellent

\_\_\_\_\_

=====

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.

Reviewer's Name Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

OUT-OF-STATE MAIL REVIEWERS' PROPOSAL EVALUATION FORM

**DUE DATE:**  
BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND  
INDUSTRIAL TIES RESEARCH SUBPROGRAM  
Non-Science/Non-Engineering Target Areas

PLEASE NOTE: This critique will be used, along with other assessments, to determine whether a proposal merits funding. The higher the score, the more clearly the proposal satisfies the criterion under consideration. Please place qualitative comments in the appropriate places. Use additional sheets as necessary.

**A. RESEARCH INNOVATION AND ACADEMIC/INTELLECTUAL RIGOR (Using national standards of excellence)**

1. Extent to which proposal demonstrates conceptual originality and clear potential to advance the quality and/or availability of Louisiana's academic and/or cultural resources           of 15 points
  
2. Extent to which the procedures and research methods are clear, appropriate and realistic within the amount of time proposed           of 10 points
  
3. Extent to which the objectives are clearly defined and can be accomplished by the proposed approach           of 10 points

**SUBTOTAL A:**           of 35 points

**COMMENTS:**

**B. SIGNIFICANCE OF PROJECT AND CONTRIBUTION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

1. Extent to which the proposed research will have a broad positive impact on State/National academic and/or cultural resources           of 14 points
  
2. Extent to which the proposed research addresses an important problem or need and represents an improvement upon, or a valid departure from, existing practice           of 8 points
  
3. Extent to which the project will yield products and/or outcomes that can be disseminated and/or utilized in other settings, such as information, materials, processes, or techniques           of 4 points
  
4. Extent to which the applicant attempted to explain how the project would promote and/or enhance economic development in the State           of 4 points

**SUBTOTAL B:**           of 30 points

**COMMENTS:**

**C. POTENTIAL FOR SUCCESS**

- 1. Training, past performance, and potential of the principal investigators of 8 points
- 2. Extent to which institutional commitment, support, and capabilities suggest high potential for success of 5 points
- 3. Extent to which the personnel have been appropriately assigned to specific tasks of 5 points
- 4. Extent to which the applicant(s) have demonstrated a commitment to the project and a capacity to continue or build upon the project when Support Fund assistance ends of 4 points
- 5. Extent to which the proposal offers the strong prospect of attracting private-sector and/or Federal funds or presents a plan to leverage Support Fund dollars in the manner most appropriate to the proposal. List possible sources: \_\_\_\_\_ of 3 points

**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 all other costs, especially equipment and supplies of 3 points

**SUBTOTAL D:** of 10 points

**COMMENTS:**

**TOTAL SCORE (A through D):** of 100 points

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

**OVERALL RATING OF PROPOSAL**

Poor      Fair      Good      Very Good      Excellent  
\_\_\_\_\_

=====

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.

Reviewer's Name and Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_