

**RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, GRADUATE FELLOWS
&
TRADITIONAL, UNDERGRADUATE, AND
TWO-YEAR INSTITUTION ENHANCEMENT**

FISCAL YEAR 2014-15

Questions and Answers about Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

Table of Contents

Questions 1-30 apply to all Support Fund programs and begin on	page 1
Questions 31-73 apply to the R & D Program as a whole and begin on	page 6
Questions 74-98 apply specifically to the RCS and begin on	page 12
Questions 99-117 apply specifically to the ITRS and begin on	page 18
Questions 118-194 apply to the Enhancement Program and begin on	page 22
• Multidisciplinary/Multi-institutional Projects	page 38
• Two-Year Enhancement Projects	page 40
Questions 195-206 apply to the Graduate Fellows Program and begin on	page 43

Questions of General Relevance

1. Q. Can I hire my husband to work on my grant as a consultant?

A. No. Faculty members are public servants and subject to the State Code of Governmental Ethics (<http://ethics.la.gov/Pub/Laws/ethsum.pdf>). This code restricts professional interactions with family members that represent conflicts of interest, into which category the hiring of immediate family members falls. Family members who share a research project may submit proposals as PI/Co-PI, but not hire one another on awards as consultants, assistants, or other paid staff.

2. Q. I plan to submit a multi-institutional proposal and understand that I must obtain approval not only from my institution but also university approval from the other collaborating institution. How should this be done given the electronic submission process?

A. A multi-institutional proposal should include in section 3 of the proposal the name of the lead institution and the name(s) of the other collaborating institution(s). Additionally, a letter signed by appropriate officials from each collaborating institution should be added to the Additional Documentation section of the proposal stating their commitment to the project.

3. Q. Are the deadlines for submission of notices of intent and proposals listed in the Support Fund RFPs absolute?

- A. Yes.
4. Q. What is the start-up date for all awards made this cycle? Is this the actual time that work is to begin?
- A. The start date for new Enhancement and R & D awards will be June 1, 2014, and work is expected to begin on or as soon as possible after that date. The start date for Graduate Fellows awards made this cycle is August 1, 2015. The one-year period after the Graduate Fellows awards are announced is intended to be used by the schools for recruitment. The first students, therefore, would begin their fellowship term in the fall of 2015.
5. Q. Who is eligible to apply for a Support Fund grant?
- A. All Louisiana public higher educational institutions and independent institutions of higher education that are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (LAICU) are eligible to apply for Support Fund grants. Only those individuals who are affiliated with a Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal, co-principal, or other investigators. Individuals not employed by a Louisiana institution of higher education may serve as consultants on the project; their contributions should be discussed in the proposal narrative.
6. Q. May a faculty member who is not a U.S. citizen compete for Support Fund grants?
- A. Yes.
7. Q. May a faculty member whose appointment does not begin until the middle of the fiscal year apply for a Support Fund grant?
- A. Yes, if the institution certifies that the investigator is an eligible faculty member.
8. Q. May a student holding a Ph.D. serve as a co-principal investigator?
- A. No. The RFP states "Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education. . .may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal or co-principal investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal."
9. Q. Who determines the eligibility of proposals?
- A. The eligibility of proposals is determined by the out-of-state consultants engaged by the Board of Regents to review such proposals for funding.
10. Q. Can more than one school be involved in a single proposal?

- A. Yes, schools are encouraged to interact with one another.
11. Q. I am working on a proposal in which my co-principal investigator is from another institution. Does he need to submit a budget from his own institution?
- A. It is not required, but it is a good idea. Including this budgetary information greatly expedites the processing of required paperwork if the project is funded. More importantly, it helps convince external evaluators that the co-PI's university is seriously committed to this project.
12. Q. Must institutional matches pledged in a proposal be honored in full in all circumstances, even if the proposal budget is significantly reduced?
- A. Institutions should not assume that proportionate reductions in institutional cost sharing will be allowed. Consultants will stipulate the circumstances under which pledged institutional cost shares may be reduced, the line items where such reductions may occur, and whether the reductions may be proportionate to Board of Regents funding for that line item or of a specified amount. In all other cases, institutions will be expected to honor their matches in full.
13. Q. Can matching funds be pledged from a source other than university funds?
- A. Yes. Applicants should be aware, however, that all matching funds pledged in a proposal, irrespective of their source, should be included in the budget and budget justification submitted with the proposal and must also be included in the budget submitted with the contract if the proposal is funded.
14. Q. In developing the budget for a proposal, how detailed does the line item breakdown of the institutional match need to be?
- A. The line item breakdown should be as complete as possible. A detailed breakdown and justification should ensure that the amount and nature of the match will be clearly understood by anyone reading the proposal.
15. Q. Does there have to be a 1:1 institutional match for every LEQSF dollar requested?
- A. No. However, a substantial match is extremely attractive to reviewers in determining a university's commitment to the project.
16. Q. May a proposal request Support Funds to pay consulting fees to an employee of a Louisiana university?

- A. Support Funds may not be used to pay any faculty member or university employee funds in excess of 100% of that faculty member's or employee's salary. Therefore, it is unlikely that Support Funds would be allowed for internal consulting fees. Support Funds may be requested for external consultants. See also the "Disallowed Budgetary Items" section of the RFPs.
17. Q. How specific should a description of requested equipment be? Is there a rule on determining if an item should be classified as equipment or supplies, such as monetary guidelines (i.e., items that cost over \$1,000 should be considered equipment)?
- A. Specificity depends on the nature and scope of the proposed project. As a rule of thumb, one should provide sufficient description so that a consultant with general knowledge of the subject area of the proposal can readily understand the need for such equipment, and how particular pieces of equipment will help to achieve the goals of the proposed project. The Board of Regents does not have rules or guidelines on how to determine whether an item should be classified as equipment or supplies, but is aware that some institutions have applied such guidelines in their accounting services. It is important for principal investigators to describe any necessary budget items in the budget pages of the proposal and carefully document these items in the budget justification. Any equipment requested with Support Fund money from the R & D Program will require at least a 25% cash match.
18. Q. May funds be requested to build a facility to house a proposed equipment project?
- A. No.
19. Q. Can Support Funds be used to purchase a vehicle?
- A. No.
20. Q. Do I include funding from both state and federal agencies on my Current and Pending Support form?
- A. Yes.
21. Q. On the Current and Pending Support Forms required for Enhancement and R & D proposals, must the investigator list the actual Support Fund proposal which is being submitted?
- A. If the investigator is listed on another Board of Regents proposal during the previous funding cycle, the other application(s) on which the investigator appears should be listed under pending support.

22. Q. Does the 15-page maximum for the narrative section of Support Fund R&D and Enhancement proposals include the bibliography?
- A. No. It also does not include any of the required forms.
23. Q. May faculty exceed the 15-page maximum for the narrative section of a proposal if they double space?
- A. No.
24. Q. Should appendices be paginated?
- A. Yes.
25. Q. My institution's Animal and Human Use Committee meets after the deadline for submission of proposals. May I submit the pending form?
- A. Yes. If your proposal is recommended for funding, the approved forms will be required prior to contract execution.
26. Q. Does the Board publish a style manual?
- A. No. Proposal format is discussed only in the current RFPs.
27. Q. Are RFPs available on CDs?
- A. No, but they are available on the Sponsored Programs home page, <http://laregents.org>.
28. Q. How do you define reform-based education?
- A. The Board of Regents subscribes to the National Science Foundation's philosophy that faculty members who vigorously combine teaching with scholarship are essential to the creation of vital education at any level and in any institution. To this end, the Board, following NSF's lead, encourages programs that seek to provide incentives and rewards to stimulate and motivate faculty members so that creative teaching and instructional scholarship become a part of the "faculty culture" at all institutions. This means that faculty members who are primarily teachers need opportunities to deepen their knowledge, while those engaged in discipline-based research need encouragement to connect their research with learning experiences for their students, and to develop expertise in innovative teaching. Reform-based education places less emphasis on the passive receipt of lecture notes and more emphasis on an interactive, inquiry-based, constructivist method of teaching.
29. Q. What published reports on reform priorities in education and teacher preparation do you accept as reliable citations and data sources?

- A. In general, the decision as to whether a citation and/or data source is reliable is left up to the applicants submitting the proposals and the external consultants reviewing them. However, the National Science Foundation has published numerous articles on the subject, as have a variety of other sources.
30. Q. Is there a restriction on being a PI on an RCS proposal and an Enhancement proposal at the same time?
- A. No.

Questions Regarding the R & D Program

31. Q. Can foreign researchers be listed as Other Investigators? If not, can they be listed as consultants and their bio-sketches provided?
- A. No. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana Institution of Higher Education (e.g. out-of-state scholars, scientist, 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.
32. Q. What is the type size and page margin for this Goals and Objectives section?
- A. The Goals and Objectives section of the application must be no longer than the equivalent of one, single-spaced, type written page.
33. Q. Can we budget for travel for foreign collaborators listed as consultants to the project to visit our lab in Louisiana?
- A. Yes. Although there is nothing in the RFP that disallows this type of budgetary request, the reviewers will carefully consider the whole budget and may not recommend all requested expenditures.
34. Q. In regards to the Research Competitiveness Subprogram, what is needed to make a case that a proposal does not violate Article VII Section 10.1 of the Louisiana Constitution?
- A. Essentially the Article stipulates that “. . . monies appropriated by the Legislature and disbursed from the Support Fund shall not . . . displace, replace, or supplant other appropriated funding for higher education. Therefore, funding for the proposed research cannot in any way replace any other funds already appropriated for higher education. In addition, Support Funds may not be requested/used to pay any faculty member or university employee funds in excess of 100% of that faculty member's or employee's salary. This is also true for ITRS proposals.

35. Q. Is it necessary to include the History of Support as well as Current & Pending Support for individuals listed as “other investigator” on the proposal?
- A. Yes.
36. Q. My institution was awarded a Title III Federal Grant; can this funding be used as institutional cost-share?
- A. Yes.
37. Q. Can I omit listing of award identifying numbers on the History of Support form?
- A. No.
38. Q. My research may qualify under several disciplines. Should I submit in one discipline versus another to increase my chances of funding?
- A. All disciplines are given equal consideration. The discipline should identify the subject area of your research as clearly and concisely as possible.
39. Q. Must I contact the outstanding scholars that I think are qualified to evaluate my proposal prior to listing them in the NOI?
- A. No.
40. Q. I understand that BOR funds may not be budgeted for fringe benefits for graduate research assistants. Are fringe benefits allowed for the PI?
- A. Yes.
41. Q. The R&D RFP states that institutions must certify that full-time employees will not, under any circumstances, receive funds in excess of 100% of their regular salaries. Does this prohibit faculty on nine-month appointments from requesting summer salary support?
- A. No. Faculty on nine-month appointments may request up to two months summer salary support from the Board. With respect to the Board’s provision of academic-year salary and to its provision of summer support for faculty and employees on twelve-month appointments, salary support provided by the Board will *substitute* for, but not augment, that portion of the faculty member’s salary.

42. Q. May the budgetary amounts requested in an R&D proposal differ from those provided in the notice of intent?
- A. Yes.
43. Q. If our institution will be the lead subcontracting institution on a joint R&D proposal with another institution, must we obtain the approval of appropriate officials from the second institution on the notice of intent?
- A. No. Only appropriate officials from the lead institution need to approve the notice of intent. Approval from investigators and officials at all participating institutions are required for the proposal.
44. Q. What percent faculty appointment with a Louisiana institution of higher education must an individual hold to be eligible to submit a proposal in the R&D program?
- A. This decision is left up to the institution. It should be noted, however, that the R&D RFP indicates that, all other factors being equal, preference will be given to proposals from full-time, tenure-track faculty.
45. Q. On how many proposals may an individual be listed as an investigator in the R&D Program? On how many projects may an individual participate as an investigator?
- A. An individual may be listed (and may subsequently serve) as a principal or co-principal investigator on one proposal submitted to the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS) and/or two proposals in the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS). An individual may appear an unlimited number of times as an Other Investigator. An individual also may act in an advisory or mentoring capacity on other proposals, in which case this investigator's contribution would be discussed only in the body of the proposal. However, investigators should note that reviewers pay close attention to the demands that multiple research projects place upon an investigator's time when deciding whether to recommend Board funding for an investigator and/or a particular project.
46. Q. Can a principal investigator submit a continuation proposal and a new proposal in the same R&D subprogram?
- A. Only in the ITRS, where the limit is two proposals per PI.
47. Q. Must I submit a Notice of Intent even if the proposal has been previously submitted?
- A. Yes.

48. Q. Within the R&D Program, will I be notified whether my Notice of Intent was accepted and, consequently, whether I will be allowed to submit a full proposal?
- A. Yes. The applicant will be notified via e-mail that the electronic submission was sent through LOGAN. Proposal submission may begin after receipt of NOI confirmation.
49. Q. On page 1 of the Notice of Intent, should Total Support Funds Requested include matching funds from other sources?
- A. No.
50. Q. The NOI cover page asks if a proposal is a new request. Is this question asking if the proposal has been submitted before or if the proposal has been funded before?
- A. The statement refers to whether the research set forth in the proposal has been funded previously through the Support Fund.
51. Q. Do Notices of Intent require the approval of co-principal investigators and other investigators?
- A. No. Only the approval of the principal investigator is required.
52. Q. May the name of a proposal, principal investigator, co-principal and/or other investigators, and amount requested change between the NOI to the proposal?
- A. Changes in title and other minor changes will be allowed. Significant changes in the thrust or scope of a project are not permitted. Changes in principal investigator will not be allowed in the RCS, but, if adequately justified, may be permitted in the ITRS. Other significant changes, such as changes in co-principal investigator(s) and/or funds requested, must be explained in writing.
53. Q. When a proposal is submitted, may the duration (number of years) of the project be changed from that stated in the Notice of Intent?
- A. Yes. A written justification is required, if requested.
54. Q. May I submit my proposal in a discipline different from the one indicated in my Notice of Intent?
- A. No.
55. Q. Is the number of subdisciplines that may be listed on an NOI limited?

- A. No. The subdisciplines should identify the subject area of your research as clearly and concisely as possible. The subdisciplines listed in the NOI serve the same function as keywords.
56. Q. May I submit a two-page document in lieu of the 250-word project summary required in an R&D Notice of Intent?
- A. No.
57. Q. Must we submit a detailed budget with the Notice of Intent?
- A. No.
58. Q. May a faculty member at a university that I attended formerly as a student be listed as a prospective reviewer on a Notice of Intent?
- A. Yes, if the applicant believes that no conflict of interest exists. A conflict of interest might arise if the prospective reviewer was a former major professor, student, or colleague of the applicant. If the applicant had little or no professional contact with the prospective reviewer, the mere fact that the applicant and prospective reviewer were at the same institution at the same or different times would not disqualify the latter as a prospective reviewer.
59. Q. Should the suggested mail reviewers listed on a Notice of Intent be published scholars possessing terminal degrees?
- A. Suggested mail reviewers should have sufficient expertise in the area of the research project to evaluate the proposal effectively.
60. Q. On a Notice of Intent, can the list of scholars qualified to review the proposal include individuals from industry, or must they be university professors?
- A. The names of individuals in industry are acceptable. Please be certain that all contact information listed for such scholars (from universities or industry) is current.
61. Q. May Canadian reviewers be recommended in the NOI?
- A. No. Only reviewers from the United States will be used.
62. Q. May an applicant revise his/her list of potential reviewers or submit the names of additional reviewers after the deadline for receipt of the NOI?
- A. No, unless the applicant discovers after submission of the NOI that a conflict of interest exists with one of the listed reviewers, or learns that a listed reviewer has died or left the continental United States. In these

exceptional circumstances, the applicant may substitute the name(s) of other reviewers on a one-for-one basis. Any substitution must be accompanied by a written justification.

63. Q. What types of information can be kept confidential?
- A. If the applicant believes that he/she has included certain information in his/her proposal that needs to be kept confidential, the applicant and the institution should review R.S. 44.4(16) of Act 102 of the 1988 Legislative Regular Session and the guidelines adopted by the Board of Regents (see the R&D RFP) and determine whether the information in the proposal fits these criteria.
64. Q. May an institution request Board of Regents salary support for an “other investigator” in the RCS? In the ITRS?
- A. In the RCS Board of Regents funds may be requested for salary support for “other investigators” only if they are not yet established researchers and if they would be eligible to apply for RCS grants in their own right. Funds should not be requested for senior faculty and established researchers serving as mentors on RCS projects. In the ITRS Board of Regents funds may be requested for salary support for “other investigators”. In both cases, requests for salary support for “other investigators” must be well justified.
65. Q. Can the PI claim part of his salary as institutional match?
- A. Yes, but only for that part of his time devoted to the Support Fund project.
66. Q. May we include our university's federally negotiated indirect cost rate as institutional match?
- A. Yes.
67. Q. Can I include requests for equipment in the second year of a multi-year R&D proposal?
- A. Yes. The prohibition of equipment requests in the second year applies only to Enhancement proposals.
68. Q. Am I to fit all three years of my R&D project onto one budget page?
- A. No. As stated in the RFP, if multi-year funding is requested, separate budget and budget justification pages must be completed for each year of the proposed project, and a cumulative budget included.
69. Q. To most effectively demonstrate one of my contentions in an R&D proposal, I need to use a videotape presentation. Is this permissible?

- A. No.
70. Q. What types of former research support must be listed in the History of Support?
- A. At a minimum, all research grants from which a principal or co-principal investigator received financial support must be detailed.
71. Q. Does the 15-page narrative limit for R&D proposals include the bibliography?
- A. No.
72. Q. I plan to ask two scholars to act as consultants on my project. Should these consultants write letters of support for the project, explaining their potential roles, or should I simply justify their presence in the proposal?
- A. Letters of support from collaborators are encouraged and should be attached to the proposal. The narrative of the proposal should also include descriptions of collaborators' roles.
73. Q. Is there a preference among reviewers for proposals offering quantitative, rather than qualitative, analysis?
- A. There is no preference given. Appropriate analysis depends on the research design of each individual project. Reviewers raise concerns when the proposed analysis seems inappropriate or ineffectual for the experimental design.

Questions regarding the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS)

74. Q. I'm an international who recently accepted a faculty position in higher education in the State of Louisiana. I currently have international research funding from Korea and am also the recipient of an Australian Science Foundation award (rescinded due to USA job acceptance). Would this prior funding make me ineligible for the Research Competitiveness Subprogram (RCS)?
- A. No, not necessarily. Although it appears that you are quite successful in competing for research funding in other countries, you do not have research funding in the United States. The specific objective of the RCS is to build and strengthen the fundamental research base and competitiveness of Louisiana's universities. The RCS is also a stimulus program directed towards researchers (junior researchers given priority) who are at the threshold of becoming nationally competitive. Ultimately, the RCS reviewers evaluate the funding history and determine the investigators' eligibility for the subprogram on a case-by-case basis.

75. Q. We have a Ph.D. student who has received a scholarship for her Dissertation from your Board 's (Doctoral fellowship Program). Her dissertation research is part of my proposal. Also, my department can provide salary support for a post doctoral fellow who will also conduct research for this project if funded by the RCS program. The money is already available. Should we list the total amount of the above funds as institutional match or should we just list the scholarship/fellowship in the application? The funding available plus the amount requested from this RCS application will exceed the total of \$200,000. Will this be OK?
- A. The Ph.D. support provided for your research project should be described in your narrative; however, only the Ph.D. support provided by your department may be included as an institutional match. Ph.D. support provided by the Board's Graduate Fellowship program may not be included as an institutional match for your project, since you would be matching LEQSF funds with LEQSF funds. Lastly, the \$200,000 monetary limitation is the maximum amount of funds that may be requested for your RCS project and should not include any additional funding available to you.
76. Q. When I submit to the RCS, am I only competing with other proposals in my discipline?
- A. No, the mail and subject-area reviewers (out-of-state experts familiar with the area of research) review each proposal 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 the national standards of excellence, the quality and relative merits of the proposed research and research plan.
- The final panel (a team of out-of-state experts) will prepare a report which ranks all proposals included in the mail and subject-area reviews. In arriving at its conclusions, this panel considers the objectives and guidelines for the appropriate subprogram, the scores and comments from the mail and subject-area reviewers, and any additional pertinent written comments to determine the final ranking of proposals recommended for funding.
77. Q. Is there a rule that the RCS program does not fund postdoctoral researchers?
- A. No. Although the reviewers regard student training as a valuable component of any research project, there are occasions where funding for a post-doc has been permitted, as long as the necessary justification was provided.

78. Q. May a colleague who is already nationally competitive for federal funding be listed as a co-principal investigator on an RCS grant?
- A. No. A nationally competitive colleague may be listed only as an “other investigator.” Please note that no Board of Regents salary support may be requested for a nationally competitive researcher, although the institution may provide release time or other forms of support as part of its institutional match.
79. Q. I am entering the second year of a two-year RCS grant. The NSF turned down my application for Federal support, citing the need for continued research. May I apply for a third year of support under the RCS?
- A. You may submit a continuation proposal in the RCS if your discipline is eligible this year, in accordance with the guidelines set forth in this year’s RFP. You should note that continuation requests compete on an equal footing with all other new and continuation proposals submitted in the RCS.
80. Q. I am a faculty member in a biological sciences department and intend to submit an RCS proposal whose subject could be characterized as either immunology or as molecular and cellular biology. Must I submit this proposal in the Biological Sciences discipline, or may I submit it in the Health and Medical Sciences?
- A. You may submit the proposal in either discipline. The discipline in which you decide to submit your proposal should be determined by the subject area that most closely approximates that of the proposal, not by your departmental affiliation. Immunology (NSF taxonomy code 0608) is a subdiscipline of the Health and Medical Sciences, while Cell and Molecular Biology (NSF taxonomy code 0206) is a subdiscipline of the Biological Sciences.
81. Q. I serve as a principal investigator for a current RCS grant. May I be listed as co-principal investigator on a new RCS proposal?
- A. No. You may appear only as an “other investigator” on any new RCS proposal. You may not request or receive compensation from the Support Fund for your participation in this new project, although your university may provide you with release time or other forms of support as part of its institutional match.
82. Q. Are non-tenure track faculty eligible to submit into the RCS?
- A. While non-tenure track faculty are eligible to apply in the RCS subprogram, it should be remembered that a goal of RCS is to elevate

Louisiana researchers to a "consistently competitive" level in the federal R&D marketplace within a limited time span (2 to 3 years). Because of the competitive nature of the RCS subprogram, out-of-state consultants are more likely to fund regular tenure-track faculty to whom the University has made a long-term commitment and who are more likely to remain in Louisiana. Most evaluators consider the employment status of an individual as evidence of institutional commitment to that individual.

83. Q. May an experienced researcher who is changing fields apply to the RCS program?
- A. Yes. The principal investigator should make a clear and compelling case in the proposal that he/she is changing research focus to a field in which the PI is not now and has not in the past been nationally competitive. The applicant should note that his/her record of publications and grants in the former research field will be considered by reviewers when evaluating the PI's ability and commitment to aggressively pursue nationally competitive status. As noted in the R&D RFP, however, junior researchers at the threshold of becoming competitive will be given priority over senior researchers who are changing fields.
84. Q. Several years ago I received an RCS grant. After that I received a Federal grant. Currently I have no research support at all. Am I eligible for the RCS?
- A. If your current RCS proposal is in a significantly different area of research from that/those area(s) funded previously by the RCS and by the federal government, you may be eligible to submit a new RCS application. You should note that the external reviewers bear ultimate responsibility for determining the eligibility of your proposal. You are advised to review carefully the eligibility criteria set forth in the R & D RFP prior to any submission.
85. Q. May I submit an RCS proposal even though I am in the process of submitting the same proposal to a federal agency?
- A. Yes. Should your proposal be funded by both the Board and the federal agency, we would negotiate an appropriate resolution to any duplicate funding.
86. Q. Is seven years at an institution too long to be considered "junior" under the RCS guidelines?
- A. This fact alone would not make you ineligible for the RCS.
87. Q. If an RCS proposal is submitted by one or more husband and wife teams, does it matter which individual is listed as PI?

- A. No. The applicants must list a single PI, however, and may wish to choose that individual who most accurately reflects RCS's desired faculty profile of a researcher on the verge of national competitiveness for R&D funding. The proposal may address the barriers to national competitiveness and present a plan to overcome those barriers from the point of view of the research team as well as from the point of view of the chosen PI.
88. Q. Can a person be listed as a principal investigator on one RCS proposal and as a co-principal investigator on another RCS proposal?
- A. No.
89. Q. Faculty member A is a PI on an RCS project. Faculty member B is an "Other Investigator." If they get an award, is Faculty B eligible next year to apply for RCS, while he's already getting support as an "Other Investigator"? Also, his future RCS submission would be a different project but somewhat similar in topic.
- A. Yes, faculty member B is eligible next year to apply for RCS. However, in light of the fierce competition for the limited dollars available and the high quality of the proposals received, he will have to make a convincing case as to why reviewers should recommend that he get additional support money for another project before other investigators get a first round of support. This doesn't mean he cannot submit a successful application, but he should address the issue up front in next year's proposal so he does not leave the reviewers wondering.
90. Q. What are the guidelines for submitting a progress report on a former grant in an RCS continuation proposal?
- A. The applicant should integrate relevant information on the former grant into the new proposal. A separate progress report is not required. The Sponsored Programs staff will append a copy of the applicant's most recent annual report to the new RCS proposal before it is sent to out-of-state reviewers.
91. Q. Do RCS proposals from major research universities receive preferential treatment?
- A. No. All proposals are evaluated according to the criteria set forth in the RFP.
92. Q. Are some of the disciplines eligible for RCS in a particular year considered "hot topics" and given preference over other disciplines?
- A. No.

93. Q. May faculty from the medical centers submit proposals in an appropriate Biological Sciences subdiscipline?
- A. Yes.
94. Q. Would receipt of a relatively small grant (up to \$50,000) from a private foundation render a principal investigator "nationally competitive" and ineligible for participation in RCS?
- A. Not necessarily. The RCS external reviewers evaluate the funding history of submitting investigators and determine the investigators' eligibility for the subprogram on a case-by-case basis.
95. Q. Would an "emerging, tenure-track faculty member" be eligible for RCS if the investigator has already received funding from a regional or national foundation?
- A. See answer to #94, above.
96. Q. May salary support for an investigator from outside sources be listed as matching funds on an RCS proposal?
- A. Yes. The budget and budget justification must make clear that the funds are coming from a source other than the institution. The applicant and institution should note that any salary match pledged in the proposal, regardless of its source, must be honored in full as a condition of funding if the proposal is awarded funding by the Board.
97. Q. I do not have reviews from previous grant proposals to substantiate the claim that I am "on the threshold" of federal funding. What other types of evidence can I use to demonstrate this?
- A. Usually past reviews or the PI's own convincing argument are all the evidence provided. Perhaps invited lectures or symposia might provide additional support for your claim.
98. Q. How do reviewers define a researcher as "established", particularly in cases in which faculty have publication records? Would the existence of published work without any funding support render me ineligible or less likely to receive RCS funding?
- A. "Senior" and "established" are adjectives generally used interchangeably, and are taken to describe a faculty member with a history in his/her field, an established reputation, and an achievement of some level of success in obtaining external funding. While the term "junior" is used to describe eligible RCS faculty, this does not mean that you must be either young in age or necessarily new to the field of inquiry. If you have been unsuccessful in garnering external support, you are eligible to apply for RCS monies. It is

important, however, that you address the barriers that have prevented your success, particularly if you have been active for several years in your discipline and have not achieved federal competitiveness.

Questions regarding the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram (ITRS)

99. Q. We have a PI submitting an ITRS proposal. The company she's working with is going to disclose a process for preparing some material that they want her to test. They want to keep the process confidential. I don't see confidentiality addressed in the ITRS award. Could we sign an NDA with the company to cover their concerns?
- A. Yes. Non-Disclosure Agreements (NDAs) are between the university and the collaborative partner/s—not the Board of Regents. The BoR in accordance with section V.A.5 of the RFP 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).
100. Q. I am planning to apply to the BoR-ITRS program. The RFP states that "Grants, awards, and "in-kind" contributions received prior to June 1, 2014, may not be applied toward any matching commitments required during the contract term." If I get funding from industry starting in Nov 1, or Dec 1, 2014 for one year, can I use this as matching funds for the competition number 2014-08, the award for which will start in June 2015?
- A. Yes. First-year funding for R&D grants is budgeted from fiscal year funds prior to the starting fiscal year of the ITRS grant. Therefore pledged matching support must be from the same period—forward. Your industry match support starting November 1, or December 1, 2014 is acceptable. However, committed match support must be expended during the granting period.
101. Q. Must you have an industry partner to submit to the ITRS Program?
- A. No, but 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.
102. Q. Does the industry partner match have to be a cash contribution?
- A. No, in-kind contributions are also acceptable.
103. Q. I am completing an ITRS project this year. My collaborator and co-principal investigator on this project wishes to continue our research and

expand its scope in collaboration with a new industrial sponsor. May my co-principal investigator submit a new proposal, or must he/she submit a continuation request?

- A. Your co-principal investigator should submit a continuation request, since he/she will be assuming the direction of an ongoing research project. Decisions to submit a new proposal or a continuation request should be based upon the nature of the research to be conducted, not upon changes in principal investigator or industrial partner(s).

104. Q. Must a rationale be submitted with an ITRS Notice of Intent?

- A. Yes.

105. Q. May funds from federal agencies, private foundations, and/or private industry be pledged as external matches on an ITRS proposal?

- A. Funds from federal agencies, private foundations, and business and industry may be pledged as external matches in ITRS, if these funds are obtained during the course of the grant and used for the specific purposes of the grant. Subject to Board approval, external reviewers are the ultimate judges of what does and does not constitute an acceptable external match. All other things being equal, and given the goals of the ITRS, matches from business and industry are preferred by the reviewers to other forms of external support.

106. Q. What types of governmental funding constitute preferred matches on ITRS proposals?

- A. Funding from governmental entities outside the State of Louisiana, which must be received during the course of the proposed ITRS grant. Matches provided by Louisiana state and/or local governmental entities may not represent the leveraging of new external funds for the state. The ITRS Final Panel has final authority to recommend to the Board what types and amounts of external funding constitute an acceptable match.

107. Q. In the Industrial Ties Research Subprogram, how important is a show of strong industrial commitment for a proposal?

- A. Very. The R&D RFP states that "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...All proposals...in this subprogram should show evidence of involvement of the private sector...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 of a Louisiana business or industry which

will attract significant revenues to the State...In the case of proposals in non-science and non-engineering target areas (e.g., tourism), private sector involvement is not necessarily a requirement, if the applicant can justify the reason for lack of involvement... 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 they will promote and/or enhance economic development in the State."

108. Q. We have submitted a NOI for the ITRS. We already possess equipment provided by the federal government and are working at a site constructed by the federal government. Can we use this support as our external match?

A. No. Matching funds for the ITRS must be expended during the course of the grant. Since you have already received this support, the federal funds used to provide equipment and construct a site would not constitute an acceptable match. Federal funds committed for expenditure during the course of the grant would constitute an acceptable match. All other things being equal, however, a proposal containing a private-sector match likely to create a new or enhance an existing Louisiana industry would be evaluated more favorably by the external reviewers.

109. Q. Does the commitment of personnel to a grant by an industrial or other private partner constitute an acceptable form of external match under the ITRS?

A. Yes.

110. Q. Must private matches for ITRS grants come from in-state companies?

A. No. But, if all other factors are equal, partnerships with Louisiana companies are preferred. One of the primary purposes of the ITRS is to promote economic development and diversification in Louisiana.

111. Q. I have received an ITRS award. Am I permitted to resubmit to this subprogram? If my resubmission is related to my previous proposal, should it be considered a continuation request?

A. The answer to both questions is yes.

112. Q. In the ITRS, may funds be requested for technology transfer-related costs? For example, may funds be requested to sponsor a statewide or regional technology transfer conference?

A. Funds may be requested for technology transfer-related costs as long as the applicant keeps in mind that the focus of the proposal must be on research.

113. Q. For a proposal submitted under ITRS, is a long-term relationship with a company required to be demonstrated before submitting the proposal?
- A. As stated in the RFP, all ITRS proposals must show evidence of significant involvement in the private sector (or significant federal funding). At the very least, a proposal must present a plan for the likelihood of providing industrial, private or federal commitment in the near future. The proposal goals must also show a potential result in the enhancement or establishment of a Louisiana business or industry that will attract significant revenues to the state.
- Also, it should be noted that if an applicant is successfully funded, work on that project should not begin before June 1, 2015. Therefore, any awards, cash, grants, or “in-kind” matching commitments cannot be applied prior to the commencement of the contract term, which for this funding cycle will be June 1, 2015, for all R&D contracts. In addition to being consistent with state contracting policies and regulations, this insures the matching commitment is applied as intended in the proposal.
114. Q. For ITRS proposals, what percentage of match from the industrial partner is required?
- A. There is no “formula” for the percentage or for the amount of industrial match required. The out-of-state experts will determine if the industrial commitments are appropriate to accomplish the proposal goals.
115. Q. Are there sub-disciplines under the eight ITRS targeted areas?
- A. The target areas for ITRS are purposely rather broad, and intended to represent technology “clusters.” The cover page of the proposal form found in Appendix B of the RFP refers to Appendix A to use in listing the three disciplines or sub-disciplines most closely reflecting the subject material of the proposal. Ultimately, the out-of-state reviewers will decide which proposals fit under the appropriate target areas at the time the proposals are sent to subject-area panelists for review.
116. Q. Can a company that has established a relationship with an investigator be named as a ‘collaborator’ on the proposal? Can the collaboration be considered as a match commitment for an ITRS proposal?
- A. 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.

Matching industrial commitments may include cash or in-kind services that must be carefully documented and itemized in the appropriate sections of the proposal. The technical merits of the proposal along with the amounts and kinds of matching support will be evaluated by the out-of-state consultants during the proposal assessment and review process.

117. Q. For an ITRS proposal, can an adjunct faculty member serve as a co-investigator, be paid two months' summer salary and also count his contribution in time as industrial/private sector match? What if he performs a large amount or most of the work?
- A. If an adjunct professor is performing most of the work, he should serve as the PI or Co-PI. The university may provide release time or other forms of support as institutional match. However, as for summer salary, we understand adjunct faculty are usually paid "by the course"; additionally it would not be appropriate to count release time as institutional match. Any salary he is being paid by private industry could be counted as industrial match. While funds may be requested for salary support for other investigators, these requests must be well justified. The role of any researcher who serves as a consultant or as an advisor should be carefully documented in the appropriate sections of the proposal.

Questions regarding the Enhancement Program

118. Q: Some years ago I received funding for an BOR Enhancement grant. At that time I requested and received funding for a multi-year (I believe it was a three-year) subscription to software. The multi-year subscription was paid for and purchased in the year of the grant. So, there was no expenditure beyond the first year. Is that still allowed?
- A: No. The portion of any subscriptions, warranties, and other time-dependent activities to be paid by grant funds cannot last beyond the contract's termination date. A longer warranty or subscription may be purchased provided the campus or another eligible funding source pays for the period beyond the contract term. The longest ENH contract term is two years.
119. Q: I have a question related to the grant that we are working on in partnership with Southeastern. We decided that SLU will submit the grant in Traditional Enhancement. We have a question regarding the Institutional Description. Because the two of us will be working in tandem on this, is it appropriate to give the background of both institutions or should SLU only be referenced since the principal investigator of the grant is located there?
- A: You should describe both institutions and how you plan to work together. The RFP says to fully explain "the nature of the relationship."

120. Q: I intend to submit two proposals (both as PI): one to Undergraduate, one to Traditional. The two proposals are related to biology but for different courses, training, and instruments. Apparently, many or most parts of the two proposals may be similar. Will they be regarded as the same or very similar proposals?

A: As long as both proposals are enhancements for different types of courses or trainings using different technologies, they will not be considered the same or similar. The reviewers make the final determination. List each proposal as pending on the both proposals' Current and Pending Support Form so that the UG and TR reviewers are aware that you are submitting two proposals.

121. Q: I have PIs who are writing an Enhancement proposal for equipment to upgrade and expand a picosatellite lab. In addition to telecommunications equipment they are requesting a 10' x 10' prefabricated outdoor storage building for antennas, platforms, etc., that should be stored outside. I was wondering if this is an allowable request or if the Board would consider this to be a construction cost. It is my understanding that there are no construction costs associated with the building. It will simply be dropped off at the designated location on campus.

A: PIs may always ask for anything they feel is an enhancement, but you are correct that the RFP classifies construction costs as disallowed budgetary items. Reviewers will decide based on the information in the proposal whether a pre-fab structure is considered "construction." The PI should anticipate any questions related to construction by fully explaining why the pre-fab structure is essential to the success of the project and an allowable expense.

122. Q: I am reading the RFP for the Two-Year Enhancement and I have a question. We are seeing great returns from last year's grant. There are certainly opportunities for us to target untapped groups/demographics and execute from additional platforms. In light of financial sustainability being more tied to tuition dollars and enrollment, I truly believe that the fact that our institution had a 15% increase is directly tied to last year's grant being implemented! I feel that I'd be negligent to our institution not to try to make a case from tapping into every possibility that exists for us to create awareness and grow enrollment, which led me to those other ideas toward this year's application.

My question is this: Section IV.D states that no proposal may seek more than one year of support. I remember you stating that perhaps this would fall under the category of a continuation grant. Since the Two-Year Enhancement [proposals should](#) focus on sustainability, is it feasible to address this as a new submission rather than a continuation and elaborate

in Section D under Previous BoR Support Fund Awards the outcomes of last year's grant to demonstrate and justify the request for another year, but with different objectives (although still related to awareness). I'm not sure if that's clear but I'm struggling with how to properly (and strategically) address the Project Summary.

A: That is a tough question—sustainability of a previous one-year award vs. funding basically the same project but with several different objectives. It is definitely a gamble whether the reviewers will be convinced. The short answer is yes, you can claim it is a new proposal and describe why you consider it to be such. And, of course, noting the perceived success of the previous award would have to be the crux of why your argument for additional funds this year. Do you have any hard statistics to back up that claim? This scenario could also play a part: There will be more dollars in Two-Year ENH this year than last year (\$690,000 was allocated in 2013-14--this year there will be \$1.1 million) and the number of proposals submitted has been decreasing steadily since the program's inception. That fact could play into the reviewers' decision, too.

123. Q. I was looking at previous years' Enhancement Program RFPs so that I could view and compare the rating forms that reviewers use to rank proposals in previous years to the revised forms in this year's (FY 2013-14) RFP. This year's evaluation forms vary from previous years in the number of points allocated for some item. Why is that?

A. The adjustment of points in some items was deliberate. Several of our reviewers had suggested that BoR staff adjust point values to allocate more points to the category of project evaluation/outcomes, an important proposal component often overlooked or given little attention in previous years' proposals. The readjusted point values reflected in this year's RFP more closely reflect current priorities of the Enhancement Program.

124. Q. The RFP states "If salary support of any kind is requested, the applicant must certify that: (a) Support Fund monies will not supplant State funds; and (b) full-time faculty and staff will not, under any circumstances, receive in excess of 100% of their regular salaries." Does "the applicant" refer to the faculty who submit the proposal (i.e., PI and Co-PI) or a higher-level administrator such as department head, dean or even president? In other words, who should issue this certification letter?

A. A formal certification letter is not required at the proposal stage -- institutional guarantee that the requirement is met will be a component of the contract budget. The project's budget justification, however, should include detailed information about any salary requests and an assurance of alignment with the requirement. The lead institution forwards the proposal to the Board after internal review; by this process the institution approves the contents of the proposal and the budget request, serving as support for your assurance therein.

125. Q. Does the partner institution also need to present a certification letter?
- A. Again, formal certification from the partnering institution is not required at the proposal stage, but will be if a contract is written. The budget justification should specify that all participants from all institutions are adhering to this requirement.
126. Q. The RFP states “For multi-institutional proposals, documentation must be provided describing the exact nature of the agreement between/among the institutions involved.” Does this mean an agreement letter must be signed between the lead institution and its partner(s)?
- A. Neither institution is required to enter into a formal agreement at this point, though it may be necessary if the proposal is funded. The proposal should include as documentation a letter from each partner institution explaining the nature of the agreement as each understands it.
127. Q. Is an agreement letter signed by the heads of participating academic programs sufficient or does the agreement letter need to be signed by higher-level administrators such as deans or even presidents?
- A. Any documentation of the proposed partnership should be provided (with electronic signature, if possible) by the offices with authority to commit the institutions to the agreement(s) outlined in the proposal. The lead institution and/or the applicant should determine whether that agreement needs to come from the dean, provost, and/or president/chancellor level.
128. Q. We seek to purchase some equipment and also to (possibly) outsource certain parts of the project. Do we need to identify in the proposal the specific vendor(s) we intend to contract for the equipment or services, or do we need to get estimates from 2-3 vendors and simply include in the proposal the amount of funding needed, then select the actual vendor after the grant is awarded?
- A. You do not have to name the vendor in the proposal. You should include any quotes from several vendors in the Additional Documentation section and list the amount you expect to spend on equipment and services on the budget page and in the justification/budget narrative. You can specify a range of prices in the justification if different vendors have varying prices. It is also a good idea to check State contract prices. You can select a vendor at any point.

129. Q. The cover page on the Traditional Enhancement proposal states: "For Special multidisciplinary submissions only: identify additional disciplines addressed by the proposal. Is that for the root discipline only or do we include the taxonomy subcategories too?
- A. You will type all taxonomy number(s) for the root and any secondary discipline(s).
130. Q. Part V, Section 3, part c – Equipment Housing and Maintenance says, **"Please note that Support Fund monies cannot be used to maintain equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund."** The equipment we are proposing is highly technical infrastructure, which cannot be repaired in any way by on-campus IT staff and must operate full-time without interruption, much like a utility or the internet, to be effective. The service contract is a required part of the technology purchase and is both a maintenance contract and a service warranty. For the purposes of this proposal, is there a difference between maintenance and a service contract? Or are they considered one and the same? If maintenance and service are separate kinds of expenses, should we do a cost allocation? Or is the need for full-time mission-critical operation sufficiently compelling to cause an exception?
- A. Since the service contract/maintenance agreement is required to be purchased by the manufacturer, it can be requested through BoRSF funds. The wording in the RFP was in response to a PI who had requested that BoRSF dollars be used to pay for separate maintenance contracts on computers over the next five years, long after the one-year award expired. That expense was in addition to the normal warranty and the manufacturer did not require it to be purchased, which is why it was disallowed.
131. Q. Since my request is for funding equipment, I assume that a vendor quote for the equipment should be included. However, I do not see this included in the instructions. If vendor quotes need to be included in a section, where should I place them?
- A. It is not necessary to have vendor quotes, but they do help. You can also attach quotes from State purchasing if the equipment you want is under State contract. See also section V.E.2 of the RFP and Q&A no. 122.
132. Q. My question is about cost sharing. I see that "discounts received" do not count as institutional match. We are planning to have the trade-in value of a current instrument credited to the total of the new instrument. I would think that since this is a trade-in, this value would count toward the institutional match, but I want to be sure that is the case.

- A. A trade-in value is similar to a discount and should not be included as match on the equipment. The campus could sell the old equipment and give the PI cash toward the purchase as match, but that is not the same as getting a benefit from the vendor on a new purchase.
133. Q. All 41 campuses in the State plan to submit a joint Multidisciplinary, multi-institutional proposal for possible funding in FY 2010-11. You are most likely aware that the LA legislature provided only modest funds to the BoR for the LOUIS in 2010-11, a program through which all higher education institutions' libraries are connected for the benefit of both faculty and students. The program was originally funded with Support Fund monies a long time ago. All of the libraries need to purchase serials. Can LA LINC, the executive committee formed to guide and manage LOUIS, submit the proposal on behalf of all libraries or does one institution have to submit on behalf of all 41? The LA LINC committee wants to request the entire \$950,000 allocated to multidisciplinary proposals; all the funds will go to one vendor but not to the individual institutions. I, the principal investigator of the project, am affiliated with a community college and also the chair-elect of the LA LINC executive committee. Should I have a co-PI from each institution? How do I document support for the proposal—in the narrative of the proposal or through support letters in the Additional Documentation section?

- A: One institution must submit on behalf of all since LA LINC is not considered an eligible institution of higher education. If the proposal is funded the payment(s) will be transmitted to the submitting institution (the community college) and this institution will be responsible for any subcontracts with partners. You may have a co-PI from each institution, but it is not necessary to do so. In the proposal you should explain for reviewers the history of the formation of LOUIS and its funding history within the 15-page limit. Given narrative page limits, it would be better to summarize partners' commitments in the narrative and put formal letters of support in the Additional Documentation. Perhaps you can prepare one letter of support on which the director of every library will sign electronically. Since written signatures from each authorized institutional representative are not required on the proposal's cover sheet, you will not have to transmit the cover sheet and supporting documentation around the State for signatures.

We have two additional suggestions. Reviewers will contrast the need for online serials for every campus in the State with much smaller (in terms of scope and monies requested) Multidisciplinary proposals. You should provide a very carefully detailed justification for how LOUIS will manage with fewer funds (perhaps no funds) beyond any BoRSF contribution in 2011-12 when the State budget for higher education is expected to experience its most severe reduction, and plans for sustainability in the future. Reviewers will want to know that they are not just "bailing out"

LOUIS for one year and that LOUIS is not intending BoRSF competitive programs, designed to provide short-term research and enhancement awards rather than indefinite programmatic support, to serve as its primary source of support for the future. They will expect to compare the statewide benefits of LOUIS with smaller requests that will possibly enhance multiple departments for years to come. You will have to convince reviewers that funding this one large proposal, which can sustain LOUIS for only one year, is more important than funding several smaller ones, and that campuses have expressed more support for the LOUIS collaboration than for smaller proposals coming directly from their campuses.

134. Q: May a faculty member who is a visiting professor apply as principal investigator of an Enhancement proposal?

A: Yes. He or she is employed by a higher education institution in the State. However, it would be a good idea to inform reviewers of his/her status, indicating whether he/she will be available to direct the entire project and plans to address a change in PI if/when it happens.

135. Q: May an institution with more than two Ph.D. programs (e.g., UNO) partner with a Louisiana institution that would qualify under the Undergraduate Enhancement Program where UNO would receive a sub-award, or at least be part of a multi-institutional proposal?

A: UNO would be ineligible to receive a sub-award under the Undergraduate Enhancement Program. However, both institutions (or perhaps more than two) may submit a multi-institutional proposal under the Traditional Enhancement program since they are both eligible to apply separately in that program.

136. Q: I notice that the total point value for “The Enhancement Plan” section of the RFP increased for an equipment request (52 to 56) and also for a non-equipment request (62 to 66). Also, 4 points were deleted from the “Additional Funding Sources” section. Where have the 4 points been allocated in each subheading in “The Enhancement Plan”?

A: On both Enhancement reviewer evaluation forms, 3 points were added to B.2 (an increase from 15 to 18), and one point was added to B.6 (an increase from 5 to 6). In the RFP’s text, the two subheading point values that were changed are V.C.2.b [Work Plan—18 points and 23 points, respectively] and V.C.2.f [Impact on faculty development—5 points to 6 points].

137. Q: I would like to purchase iPads for my education pre-service students and teach them how to use the iPads for effective assessment and instruction. Upon receiving their teacher certification, students would retain their iPads to use in their beginning teaching assignments, thereby positively affecting K-12 student learning. The majority of our education students certify to

teach in Louisiana public schools, so this would directly benefit LA K-12 education. Does the Board discourage ideas like mine in which the technology purchased with the grant would move off the campus that received the grant?

A: Equipment purchased with BoRSF or State funds may not be given away to an individual or to another institution. By State law ownership must be retained by the purchasing institution and the property disposed of as surplus after its useful life is over. It cannot be donated even to K-12 schools. Additionally, the BoRSF contract is between the institution and the BoR, not the PI and the BoR. The equipment belongs to the institution both during the grant and after the grant expires.

138. Q: Since the point values for institutional match have been removed from the rating form, is it still to my advantage to seek an institutional match?

A: Proposals will no longer be rewarded or penalized for a lack of institutional match via the point value system. However, a match does demonstrate that the principal investigator made the effort to leverage the request for BoRSF funds as much as possible. It also demonstrates commitment and support from the institution for your project.

139. Q: Can the same PI submit two grant applications in the same disciplinary category in the same Enhancement subprogram?

A: Yes, but he or she would be competing against himself/herself.

140. Q: What items fall under the 15-page limit for the Traditional Enhancement Program? Does the page limit apply also to Previous BOR Support Fund Awards or Budget and Budget Narrative/Justification?

A: The narrative section can include brief narrative information about previous Support Fund awards received by the PI/Co-PI within the last 6 years (two funding cycles) and a bibliography if that is appropriate. It does not include the Current and Pending Support Form, the budget form and budget narrative, the biosketch form for the PIs and Co-PIs, or any additional documentation such as letters of support, equipment specifications, etc.

141. Q: My department has received BoR support in the Environmental Sciences in the past. We are seeking to enhance our web server infrastructure with new servers and storage to enable us to leverage new web technologies to advance our web presence in research, education, and emergency response. As a unit in the Department of Oceanography and Coastal Sciences, are we eligible to apply in the Computer Sciences discipline?

A: You are eligible to submit in any Enhancement category. It is up to the

review panels to decide if a proposal truly fits a competition. Proposals are often dismissed during reviews for this reason. The onus is on you to prove that your project is actually related to the study of Computer Sciences (as in computer science curricula and degree programs). This may be the case if you plan to have computer science grad students/ undergrads designing websites or software for your labs, or some related project. If your project does include or affect computer science faculty, majors, classes, etc., then it is certainly appropriate for the CIS competition. You may also want to consider the Multidisciplinary competition if your project actually combines the departmental efforts of computer science and oceanography. See also the section of this Q&A related to the multidisciplinary component of the Traditional Enhancement program.

142. Q. Can a university's academic enhancement funds be considered as match? Our campus recently finished construction of a covered addition to the sculpture facility and created a new foundry. These additions have provided space for adding new equipment and offering new courses, for which we plan to write an Enhancement proposal. Can the cost of the structure be pledged as a match?

A. The PI can pledge almost any type of funds to match BoRSF monies (except that other State funds that are dispersed through the Board of Regents, such as the Library and Scientific Acquisitions fund, cannot be used as match). The PI can pledge institutional funds, departmental funds, funds from a business or corporation, federal funds, etc. The cost of the covered addition and foundry should be considered as institutional match by reviewers. Fully explain every source of matching funds and from where they derive in the budget justification.

143. Q. LSUHSC-Shreveport is planning to submit a proposal involving the undergraduate nursing programs at several universities, with LSUHSC-Shreveport providing education services to the schools. My question has two parts:

Q.1. If the proposal involves multiple institutions, can there be multiple PIs?

A.1. Yes. However, LSUHSC-Shreveport is ineligible to receive funds through the Undergraduate Enhancement Program.

Q.2. Does the fiscal agent have to be from one of the investigator institutions?

A.2. The fiscal agent is with the submitting "lead" institution.

144. Q. The RFP states that faculty summer salary may not be requested except in unusual or compelling circumstances. Since our project involves a lot of faculty work rather than purchase of equipment, how strongly is faculty

salary discouraged?

- A. The RFP restricts requests for faculty summer support to no more than 2/9ths of his/her AY salary for a nine-month employee. The BoR staff cannot predetermine if reviewers will permit summer salary. Summer salary awards have been made when, in the judgment of reviewers, a sufficient case for them was made.
145. Q. The Taxonomy of Disciplines does not indicate a specific discipline for the Aquatic Sciences. My proposal could be submitted as 0106 (Fishery Science), 0110 (Resource Management), or 0502 (Environmental Sciences). Please help.
- A. BoR staff members do not advise PIs in which discipline or what specific sub-discipline(s) a given proposal aligns best. However, your proposal's focus would seem to fall under the Earth/Environmental Sciences. Rarely does only one sub-discipline encompass all elements of a proposal. Fully explain the proposal's benefit to the Earth/Environmental Sciences.
146. Q. The goal of our project is to renovate a 1970s vintage AirStream trailer into a traveling gallery/studio/classroom, which will be used to introduce film, video and multimedia design and production in an exciting and inventive setting on-site at K-12 schools, community centers, and other cultural sites and events. We propose to hire a professional architect to design and facilitate renovations, which will incorporate ADA-approved access. Our budget will include funds for design services, renovations and security; and outfitting the trailer with state-of-the-art multimedia and computer equipment. Would renovating a travel trailer into a gallery/studio/ classroom be considered "construction of facilities" and thus be ineligible for funding?
- A. The RFP specifically excludes "routine" renovations or upgrading rooms and buildings, but at times reviewers have recommended funding for rewiring of buildings to house new computer labs, multimedia facilities, etc. In previous years consultants have reviewed proposals requesting purchase and outfitting of student mobile learning labs for testing water quality, mobile vans to provide equipment to teach firefighters who work in remote areas, and a motorized boat in which students can perform tests at lake sites in south Louisiana. Purchase of the vehicle itself has been denied, although sometimes specialized equipment for the vehicle was recommended for funding.
- A successful proposal boils down to these elements: 1) a great need for the project is expressed; 2) clear, convincing writing; 3) a reasonable budget and budget justification; 4) good evaluation mechanisms; and 5) broad impact. The latter point can be emphasized by answering these questions in your proposal: Will your project impact a large number of students? Will it attract high paying jobs in the area? Will exposure to the

project and the training students receive through it help them in gaining such employment? Will the project promote regional/statewide economic development?

147. Q. Our community college is working in collaboration with the LSU Ag Center for delivery of courses in northeast Louisiana. Our question has three subparts:

Q.1. Do we include institutional information about the LSU Ag Center under *1.A, Current situation/institutional description*?

A.1. Yes, as well as institutional information relating to the community college.

Q.2. Do we include personnel information concerning LSU Ag Center personnel that would be involved in facilitating implementation of the grant under *2.D, Faculty and Staff expertise*?

A.2. Yes.

Q.3. How do we list the support provided by the LSU Ag Center for facilities, personnel, maintenance, etc.? Would this be included on the budget page?

A.3. Yes, use the Other institutional match column. Also, be sure to include appropriate explanatory information in the budget narrative.

148. Q. Under what circumstances can university professors earn additional salary through the Enhancement Program? Can the project pay stipends to faculty for participation in workshops, seminars, weekend activities, etc.?

A. Faculty members on academic-year appointments may be paid summer support through the Enhancement Program ($2/9^{\text{th}}$ of AY salary for nine-month employees, and $1/9^{\text{th}}$ for ten-month employees). Faculty and staff on twelve-month appointments may not receive any summer salary. For all faculty participants, requests for any payments during the academic year, including salary support, stipends, and other supplemental pay, must be fully offset by release time from the institution. This is true even if the proposed activities are extracurricular, taking place at night or on weekends, and if other participants, like students, are receiving stipends for their participation. The release provided by the institution must equal or exceed the payments for faculty support requested from the Board of Regents. Under no circumstances may a faculty member at a Louisiana institution receive more than 100% of his/her salary through a Support Fund grant.

149. Q. My university has established a research center. We are considering

submitting an Enhancement proposal that would include a request to fund a post-doctoral researcher to manage the computational math section of the center. Would a proposal of this type be likely to be funded?

- A. It is impossible to know. Generally, the Enhancement Program does not provide funds for creation and continuation of staff positions because funding can only be provided for a very brief period. If you can demonstrate, however, that the requested position will enhance the center, that the impact of the project will be substantial, and that the university is committed to continuing and funding the position beyond the life of the award, your proposal might be considered favorably, with all other things being equal.
150. Q. May potential beneficiaries or end users of a projected system be listed as co-principal or other investigators on the cover page of a proposal?
- A. No. Only active collaborators in a project should be listed as investigators on the cover page of a proposal. The principal investigator may wish to identify beneficiaries or end users of a projected system in the appropriate section of the narrative and/or include letters of support from projected beneficiaries or end users with his/her proposal.
151. Q. May I request Enhancement funds to build a greenhouse?
- A. No. Funds for new construction or renovations to existing construction may not be requested from the Support Fund, but may be provided as institutional matching funds.
152. Q. May a college or university submit a Traditional Enhancement proposal to enhance a research laboratory?
- A. Yes, if the laboratory is a unit within the institution. As stated on page 1 of the RFP, the Enhancement Program considers proposals whose objectives are to enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units, and to promote economic development (underlining added).
153. Q. Is a center or institute of a university eligible to submit an Enhancement proposal?
- A. Yes, if the center or institute has already been approved by the Board of Regents through its regular Academic Affairs approval process and if the proposal is submitted in a discipline eligible for that year. As stated in the Enhancement RFP, funds may not be requested for anticipated centers or institutes which require Board approval prior to their establishment and which have not been approved by the Board of Regents prior to submission of the proposal.

154. Q. Is a Notice of Intent required for Enhancement proposals?
- A. No.
155. Q. Is the number of Enhancement proposals which a department or unit may submit in a given year limited?
- A. No.
156. Q. Can an institution of higher education with two or fewer doctoral degree programs submit proposals to both the Traditional and Undergraduate Enhancement Programs if the proposals address different projects?
- A. Yes.
157. Q. Can a proposal requesting equipment primarily for a master's-level program, but also benefiting the undergraduate program, be submitted in the Undergraduate Enhancement program?
- A. Yes, as long as the submitting department/institution meets the eligibility requirements for participation in the Undergraduate Enhancement program, as specified in the RFP.
158. Q. Is the Undergraduate Enhancement Program open to all disciplines?
- A. No. The Undergraduate Enhancement Program is open only to those disciplines identified in the RFP as eligible for Enhancement funding in the current funding cycle.
159. Q. Can a person be listed as principal investigator on more than one Enhancement proposal?
- A. Yes.
160. Q. Must the academic orientation of a proposed principal investigator be within the disciplines eligible for funding in Enhancement?
- A. Not necessarily. The primary factor determining a proposal's eligibility is not the academic orientation of the principal investigator, but whether the proposal will significantly enhance instruction and/or research in one or more of the disciplines identified as eligible for funding.
161. Q. May a non-faculty staff member serve as co-principal investigator on an Enhancement grant? The staff member will be the primary operator of the equipment being requested.
- A. Yes, as long as the co-PI is employed by an eligible institution of higher education in Louisiana.

162. Q. What is meant by a continuation of an Enhancement proposal? Can you give an example?
- A. In general, a continuation request is a proposal that asks for support for the same or a very similar project previously funded through the Support Fund. In the Enhancement Program a continuation proposal might be a request for funds to support a curricular revision project or a symposium that had been supported in a previous year. It should be noted that because Support Fund money was never intended to supplant State funds, it may not be used as continued/ongoing support for a program or its activities. For this reason, the Board does not encourage the submission of continuation requests in the Enhancement Program.
163. Q. One of our principal investigators is planning to apply for funding under the Enhancement Program. If funded, the PI then plans to apply to the National Science Foundation's Undergraduate Education Program and use the state Enhancement award as cost-sharing? Is this permissible?
- A. Yes. A request to use Enhancement funds as matching funds for another award will be considered on its merits by the Board. The request to use a Support Fund grant as matching funds must be fully explained in the narrative.
164. Q. Will a request for second-year funding reduce an Enhancement proposal's chances for funding?
- A. No. A request for second-year funding is not prejudicial to the success of an Enhancement proposal. Applicants under the Enhancement program may request up to \$50,000 in second-year funding. However, note that external reviewers may recommend to the Board a reduction in or the elimination of a second-year funding request.
165. Q. I wish to submit an Enhancement proposal focusing on the development and redesign of an undergraduate curriculum. Is such a proposal eligible under Enhancement?
- A. Yes, if the category under which the proposal is submitted is an eligible category for that year, and to the extent that the proposal's objectives "enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments or units and ... promote(s) economic development."
166. Q. Is release time an allowed budgetary request in Enhancement proposals?
- A. Except in compelling and unusual circumstances, BoRSF support may not be requested for faculty release time. See additional explanation in section V.G., "Funds for Principal Investigators and Support Personnel" in the Enhancement Program RFP.

167. Q. Can Enhancement monies be requested for equipment and travel costs needed to establish a research center?
- A. Yes, but the awarding of monies to cover such costs should not be regarded as tacit approval for the envisioned research center.
168. Q. Are costs for travel to conferences and colloquia for faculty enrichment and development eligible for funding in Enhancement?
- A. Yes. According to the Enhancement RFP, any activity is eligible if the applicant argues convincingly that it will enhance the infrastructure of the particular academic, research, or agricultural department or unit involved.
169. Q. Is it correct to use the “other” line item on the budget sheet for faculty salaries?
- A. Yes, but the “other” line item must be broken down into its component parts and clearly justified in the budget narrative.
170. Q. We plan to submit an Enhancement proposal that requests funds to purchase workstations for a multi-purpose laboratory. Since chairs and bookshelves will be essential to the completion and effective utilization of this lab, can funds necessary for the purchase of such items be included as part of the institutional match?
- A. Yes. Funds for the purchase of regular office equipment, including chairs and bookshelves, may not be requested from the Support Fund and normally are included as part of the institutional match. To the extent that ancillary items are integral to the requested workstations, however, funding for such items may be requested under the Enhancement program. Subject to final approval by the Board of Regents, external consultants are the judges of what does and does not constitute an acceptable budgetary request.
171. Q. I am trying to determine whether or not my Enhancement proposal is primarily a request for equipment. What criteria should I use?
- A. If the “Support Funds Requested” column on the budget page(s) of your proposal calls for 50% or more of expenditures in the categories of “equipment, supplies, software,” your proposal should be considered primarily an equipment request. Sponsored Programs staff may reclassify a proposal to ensure that it is properly designated as a primarily equipment or primarily non-equipment request.
172. Q. How much information do you require on proposals involving purchase of a piece of equipment?

- A. The proposal should contain as much specific information about the item as possible, including the brand name, price, specifications, etc. The applicant is also encouraged to include any quotations and/or brochures from vendors or State purchasing guidelines.
173. Q. Is a department that has received an Enhancement grant for equipment purchases in the past be allowed to submit a proposal requesting upgrades for the previously purchased equipment?
- A. Yes.
174. Q. Is an institutional match required on an Enhancement proposal?
- A. No
175. Q. In an Enhancement proposal, what is the minimum institutional match required for the purchase of an instrument costing approximately \$180,000?
- A. No minimum institutional match is required.
176. Q. Where should Letters of Support be included in an Enhancement proposal?
- A. In the Additional Documentation section.
177. Q. Is an "equipment" proposal more likely to be funded than a "non-equipment" proposal?
- A. No. The type of proposal has nothing to do with its chances of success; rather, the quality of the proposal determines its likelihood of being funded.
178. Q. Exactly what does the Board consider as cost sharing/institutional match? Would a technician's salary that is paid by a federal grant that I have received be considered institutional match? The technician will begin work on the prospective Support Fund project in June.
- A. Cost sharing is defined as any type of support, financial or otherwise, that is provided by an educational institution, department, unit, external organization, or business/industry. It may be monetary (e.g., salary support for release time or partially contributing to the cost of equipment), or in-kind (software provided free of charge by the computer manufacturer). The technician's salary can be listed in the Private Sector/Other Match column on the budget form, but his/her salary cannot be counted as matching funds until after June 1 when the contract term begins.

179. Q. Section III(F), Cost Sharing and Matching Commitments, stipulates that “Depending on consultants’ recommendations, matching commitments may have to be honored in full even if the award is reduced.” We interpret the word *may* to mean this is somewhat negotiable. Thus, our intention is to reserve the need to proportionally reduce cost sharing if the funded amount is reduced significantly (i.e., 10% or more). Is this interpretation in keeping with your policy on this? In your opinion, if we stipulated this caveat within our budget justification, would it hurt the chances of something being awarded? Could we have some clarification as to what kind of flexibility we have with proportionate reduction of cost sharing in the event of significant reduction of award?

A. We do not consider the word *may* to mean “somewhat negotiable.” Whether or not institutional matching funds are reduced is a recommendation in the purview of external reviewers. Only they make recommendations to reduce cost sharing and in which budget categories those reductions may be made. It is quite likely that a caveat such as you propose would hurt your proposal’s chances of being funded.

180. Q. Does the Enhancement RFP place restrictions on the per-diem the principal investigator can be reimbursed for travel related to the grant?

A. No. All travel associated with Support Funds must be undertaken and reimbursed according to the State Travel Regulations, PPM 49.

181. Q. What is the average amount of institutional matching funds for an Enhancement proposal?

A. The Board of Regents has not and will not determine an average amount. For some proposals, no institutional funds are matched while for others the match exceeds the Support Fund money requested. Proposals with all levels of matching support have been funded.

Multidisciplinary/Multi-institutional Projects

182. Q. Our department will submit two Enhancement proposals this year. One will enhance our undergraduate program and the other our graduate program. Would these proposals be considered multidisciplinary?

A. No, unless one or both of the proposals will also benefit another department or unit. Two or more academic disciplines must be involved in a project for it to be considered multidisciplinary.

183. Q. In the Enhancement RFP, special rules are provided for multidisciplinary/multi-institutional projects. Do you have any additional suggestions for applicants in this category?

- A. The only suggestions the Board staff can offer are applicable to all Enhancement proposals: explain the project's activities and potential benefits well and be sure that the project meets all eligibility requirements. In the case of multidisciplinary projects, applicants should clearly explain the reasons for and benefits of combining the disciplines into a single project. If the project is multi-institutional, applicants should fully describe the commitments of each participating institution.
184. Q. When an applicant applies under the multidisciplinary component, how are the disciplines defined? For example, exercise physiology, motor behavior, sports psychology, and athletic training are all sub-disciplines of Kinesiology, and faculty generally carry out their research strictly within the sub-disciplines. In teaching, however, faculty often use the same equipment and materials regardless of their specialization or sub-discipline. Would a project to purchase equipment and materials for combined use among sub-disciplines be considered multidisciplinary?
- A. Since the sub-disciplines all fall into the Kinesiology category in the taxonomy of disciplines, a proposal including these sub-disciplines would not be multidisciplinary. To be eligible in the multidisciplinary component, the content of the project – its general topic – should involve multiple departments or colleges. In addition, the more eligible disciplines a multidisciplinary proposal can legitimately include in its enhancement plan, the better the project's chances for success. It is important to note, however, that all disciplines included must be genuinely linked to the project and its objectives, and not included in name only. In any multidisciplinary proposal, at least one of the included disciplines must be eligible for Enhancement funds in the submission year. Our reviewers will make final determinations about the eligibility of proposals submitted under any program or component.
185. Q. I plan to buy a piece of equipment to be used by myself and a faculty member at another university. Will it strengthen the proposal to include the other faculty member as a co-PI?
- A. Provided the proposal fully explains the partnership, the equipment's impact on both institutions, and the number of faculty and students who will benefit from the project, it does not matter how faculty from other institutions are listed. If you plan, however, to submit a multi-institutional proposal and/or secure matching funds from a second institution, it is in your best interest to list a faculty member from that institution as a co-PI.
186. Q. Must a special multidisciplinary proposal involve one or more of the eligible disciplines for that year?

- A. Yes. Because the Board of Regents remains committed to the concept of rotating eligibility of disciplines, a special multidisciplinary proposal must involve at least one of the eligible disciplines for that year.
187. Q. I am a faculty member in the Chemistry Department and I am writing a multidisciplinary proposal that involves Chemistry, Biology and one other discipline. Will my proposal be disqualified if I submit it under Biological Sciences even though a larger proportion of the requested Support Funds will benefit Chemistry?
- A. Your proposal will not be disqualified as long as you have checked both the Multidisciplinary and the Biological Sciences category on the cover page. However, the external consultants will examine how the proposed project will favorably impact Biology. The stronger case you make for benefiting the Biological Sciences, the better chance your proposal has of receiving some funding.

Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions Projects

188. Q: The Two-Year Enhancement RFP states that institutional demographic data are to be submitted on an electronic form/template. Are we limited to the form, or do we get to include narrative demographic information as well? It makes a difference how we fill out the form—for instance, the form asks for the service area (Acadia, Evangeline, and St. Landry are our campus' core service areas). Now that our campus is the designated community college for CenLA, we normally list at least Rapides as part of our service area as well. However, we have our largest student body in the history of the institution this year with students from 57 parishes and over 400 students from out-of-state and foreign countries. Our campus administrators have indicated that they believe some of this information should be included in the demographic data. How can we do that?
- A: Add any explanations of demographic data in the narrative section.
189. Q: I know of an LTC faculty member who is preparing a Two-Year Institution Enhancement proposal to submit independently of a two-year institution/community college or four-year campus. The RFP states that an LTC or four-year campus can only be listed in collaboration with one or more two- or four-year campuses. Isn't an LTC ineligible to submit an Enhancement program proposal of any type on its own?
- A: Yes.
190. Q. This is a two-part question:
- Q.1. The Eligibility section of the Two-Year Institution RFP mentions faculty, administrators, and professional staff as being eligible to be PIs.

How is *faculty* defined? Can an adjunct faculty member be a PI, or does it only apply to a full-time faculty member or a full-time, tenure track faculty member? We have a pressing need to upgrade our organic chemistry lab/program, but the person willing to write the application and be the PI is an adjunct. Our division head could be listed and would be involved in any project; however, her background is not in this area.

A1. Yes, an adjunct instructor can be the applicant PI. As long as your institution will vouch for the individual, any person employed by a community college can submit an Enhancement Program proposal and serve as PI.

Q.2. If an adjunct manages and is the PI for the project, additional compensation would be involved. I remember that we can hire for a position if the institution agrees to carry it for at least a year thereafter. However, these Two-Year Institution awards are only for a single year, and the duties of the position would be complete at the end of that year, other than that the PI would continue to teach in the program as he is now doing.

A.2. The reviewers will decide on the merits of the proposal vs. your campus' not being able to carry the new position for an additional year. Just be sure to carefully explain why the campus will not or cannot carry the project for another year.

191. Q. Our proposal meets many initiatives listed under the Guiding Principles. Some of the initiatives include delivery of instruction and development of faculty teaching techniques. The proposal requests computers, document readers, projectors, software, and multimedia workstations. My team is in the planning phase, so I have some questions.

Q.1. Do we need to request quotes from specific vendors?

Q.2. Next, we need guidance for the evaluation of project outcomes. Should we provide pre- and post-project surveys to examine the improvement of instruction? Should we evaluate the equipment?

Q.3. Would you clarify "college business and operational systems" in this statement: Incorporate use of technological advances into college business and operational systems to support teaching and learning. Our proposal refers to possible initiatives in the Curricula Revisions and Workforce Development guiding principles.

A. We will answer your questions one at a time.

A.1. It would not hurt to have quotes from specific potential vendors, but check the State contract prices for the same equipment. Some equipment may not be on State contract, but if it is, the price is usually, but not always, cheaper. What you want to do is convince reviewers you are getting the best bang for the buck.

A. 2. Evaluating project outcomes is a difficult question to answer since we do not know specifically what you plan to do with the multimedia equipment, though obviously the equipment is related to technology in the delivery of instruction as well as helping faculty become more proficient in teaching using multimedia. It is insufficient to state as an evaluation method that the project will prove successful if the equipment performs the functions for which it is intended. Use measureable statistics such as “this project intends to make 25% of our faculty more proficient (or comfortable with) using multimedia in their classes” or “this project will positively impact the grades of a minimum of at least 35% of students that take online courses through administration of pre- and post-tests that not only measure faculty and student satisfaction with the equipment, but also measure the extent that their grades have improved.” You could describe how the surveys will be structured in the narrative section.

A.3. You may be hoping to acquire new multimedia equipment to upgrade technologies for campus business functions also. You should be as specific as possible if the equipment is for academic purposes (e.g., to upgrade technology in curricular offerings) or for purely administrative purposes, or both.

192. Q. Why is the Louisiana Technical College (LTC) ineligible to apply for funding under the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions?

A. Previously the LTC received funding through the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE), which has its own source of monies called 8(g) funds. However, several years ago when the LTC was transferred to the auspices of the Board of Regents, the LTC formally agreed not to be eligible to receive BoRSF awards.

193. Q. We are working on a collaborative grant with an LTC for articulation of a program. We would like to request duplicate equipment and supplies for delivery of some 100-level courses to assure consistency of course content/delivery. Would the equipment and supplies purchased for the LTC be the property of the LTC? Also, similar to the question above, would we include institutional and personnel information from the LTC and also list support on the budget page? Could we "check-out" the equipment/supplies from our community college to the LTC or its off-site training laboratory for a semester or year, as long as we address the security of equipment?

A. No Enhancement project can permanently place duplicate equipment and supplies at a technical college (i.e., the LTC cannot own any BoRSF-purchased equipment). However, it is possible that reviewers could approve an arrangement for laptops and other electronic equipment to be used at the LTC that would be owned by the community college and

whose security would remain with the college. As long as you adequately explain the enhancement plan--i.e., how you will use the equipment/supplies in course delivery--the reviewers could approve a well-designed check-out system.

Similarly, the higher education portion of the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund (the BoRSF) cannot be used to provide monetary support (or even provide stipends for attending workshops) to LTC faculty. Note that pg. 1 of all Enhancement Program RFPs explains the division of Trust and Support Fund monies into the higher education portion and the K-12 portion as a fifty-fifty arrangement. For this reason BoRSF cannot be used to support or pay stipends to public school teachers. The latter are eligible to receive support through the K-12 portion of the fund, commonly called 8(g).

194. Q. I am helping community colleges in my area submit an application under the Enhancement Program for Two-Year Institutions. May I request that Support Funds be used to pay stipends to three graduate students who are working on a degree at LSU but who help out at the colleges?
- A. Yes. However, any request to support graduate students must be clearly explained and justified.

Questions regarding the Graduate Fellows Program

195. Q: Can the form 12-GF be modified to reflect more types of publications than just monographs and journal articles, to make room for edited collections, book chapters, books of poetry, novels, creative works, translations, etc.? This would allow faculty productivity to be more accurately reflected.
- A: The form may be adjusted as necessary to report the information the submitting department or unit believes is relevant, provided the proposal clearly indicates how the panel is to interpret the table as presented (i.e., which publications were counted, how determinations were made as to what to include, etc.) and provided all self-published works are excluded.
196. Q: In an application for BoR/SREB fellowships, can the definition of under-represented minorities (URM) include women as an underrepresented group eligible to receive fellowship support?
- A: Program guidelines do not set a 'standard' definition of URM for the BoR/SREB program. Instead, the proposal requires the applying institution to define URM for the purposes of the fellowship (on Form 4-SREB) and the review panel considers the definition as part of the application. If women were to be included in the definition of underrepresented minority, the application must strongly justify the inclusion as reasonable and, depending on how the application is framed, provide some assurance that

women would only be eligible as URMs in specified disciplines (given high levels of participation and even majority status of women across many disciplines). The case for defining women as URMs in particular disciplines should be supported by quantitative data, not only from the submitting campus but also nationally, showing that women are systemically underrepresented.

197. Q: Can a campus pledge other institutional match for fellowship recipients, including equipment, supplies, and travel, in lieu of providing tuition? In these cases, fellowship recipients could receive financial aid to pay tuition and fees.

A: No. The RFP specifies that the institution must provide full tuition for all fellowship recipients during the life of the award. Other institutional matching is allowed and encouraged, but must be in addition to tuition support.

198. Q: What is the minimum number of degrees a department/unit must produce in a year to be competitive in the GF program?

A: There is no minimum number required or recommended and GF regularly funds both large and small degree programs. The most competitive proposals are those that demonstrate their success in the activities that count most in all graduate programs: recruiting excellent students, ensuring students make steady progress, and bringing students to a timely completion of the intended degree.

199. Q: In their final report the Graduate Fellows Review Panel expressed concern that proposals were breaching privacy rights by providing personal information about students and requested that applicants remove this information from their proposals. What kind of information does this include?

A. The Board expects all applicants to the Graduate Fellows Program not to disclose personal information about students or faculty involved in their programs, particularly since these proposals are public documents and available to all citizens upon request. Applicants may include any student information that is in the public domain, including awards won, work histories, graduation records, and so forth. Any information that is private to the individual student should be eliminated, particularly grade point averages, GRE scores, personal endorsements, and other documents. Aggregated information on test scores is expected, but individual information is strictly disallowed. Certain information, like an individual student's research focus or special circumstances of which the panel should be aware, can be presented while maintaining the student's anonymity. When the applicant is uncertain into which category a certain piece of information about an individual student falls, the Board

encourages caution and prefers the applicant to keep the student anonymous or omit the information altogether.

200. Q. May a principal investigator submit more than one Graduate Fellows proposal?
- A. According to the Graduate Fellows RFP, the LSU Health Sciences Center in New Orleans, the LSU Health Sciences Center in Shreveport, and the Tulane Medical Center may submit up to three Graduate Fellows proposals in years in which “Health and Medical Sciences” is an eligible discipline. Colleges and universities may submit one proposal per year per eligible discipline in the Traditional Graduate Fellows Program and one proposal per year in each of the eligible mathematics and sciences disciplines in the Graduate Fellowships for Teachers Program. No restrictions upon multiple submissions by principal investigators apply, other than those that may be imposed by the above regulations.
201. Q. Can a Graduate Fellows application request support for a fellowship recipient's tuition?
- A. No. Tuition must be provided as part of the institutional match.
202. Q. Can Graduate Fellows stipends be supplemented by the department to provide an increased level of support to the student?
- A. Yes, additional funds may be added to the Graduate Fellows stipend, provided no additional work is required as a condition for any increase. Any increase in stipend level can be claimed as matching funds in the proposal. A PI is not permitted, however, to provide Fellows with teaching or research assistantships for additional pay without the permission of the Board, which is granted on a case-by-case basis only.
203. Q. What is the maximum stipend level allowed by the Board of Regents?
- A. There is no prescribed maximum or minimum stipend level for BOR Recruitment of Superior Graduate Students (RSGS) Fellowships. The review panel will determine whether requested stipend amounts are competitive in the market, and are sufficient to attract and retain truly superior students. The panel can recommend reductions or increases in stipends from requested amounts if the experts determine such changes are warranted.
204. Q. Can a department submit a proposal in each year of eligibility, or is there a restriction preventing consecutive submissions?
- A. There is no restriction against a department or college submitting a proposal each year in which its discipline is eligible.

205. Q. Can a faculty member who has accepted a job at another institution beginning in the academic year following proposal submission act as the Principal Investigator for a Graduate Fellows project for the proposal submission phase?
- A. While the Board has no restriction against a faculty member who knows himself/herself to be leaving the institution writing and submitting a Graduate Fellows proposal, it is not recommended that the faculty member do so because changes in PI require substantial paperwork from the submitting institution and the Board of Regents. This work, moreover, probably will not be offset by any particular benefit to the submitting institution. A competitive proposal should include several faculty members of distinction, thus not require the participation of a single faculty member to ensure success.
206. Q. Can a graduate program that has received provisional approval from the Board of Regents submit a proposal in the Graduate Fellows program?
- A. Yes. In the event, however, that provisional approval is rescinded by the Board, any award made to such a program would be cancelled.