

BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Guidelines for the Submission of

Departmental Enhancement Proposals

Proposals Due:
November 14, 2017
4:30 p.m. Central

FISCAL YEAR 2017-18

Request for Proposals, Number 2017-05

P. O. Box 3677

Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70821-3677

(225) 342-4253

<https://web.laregents.org>

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. BASIS OF AUTHORITY

Article VII, Section 10.1, of the Louisiana Constitution established two funds in the State Treasury: the Louisiana Education Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) and the Board of Regents Support Fund (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received from settlement of disputed oil and gas revenues generated in the so-called 8(g) section of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Twenty-five percent of the interest earned from investment of money in the Trust Fund, as well as 25% of recurring 8(g) oil and gas revenues, will continue to be returned to the Trust Fund, until it reaches a cap of \$2 billion. Each fiscal year the remaining 75% of the interest earned and 75% of the recurring oil and gas revenues are placed in the Support Fund for appropriation by the Legislature.

B. PURPOSES OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS SUPPORT FUND

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

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

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

Reflecting these Constitutional mandates, Board of Regents policies affirm that awards in all categories will be based on the potential for the award to enhance the overall quality of higher education in Louisiana; and the potential for the award to enhance the economic development of the State.

C. PUBLIC NATURE OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED

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

II. THE DEPARTMENTAL ENHANCEMENT SUBPROGRAM

A. OBJECTIVES

Based on Constitutional mandates and policies adopted by the Board, the objectives of Enhancement programs are to enhance the infrastructure of academic, research, or agricultural departments/units and to promote economic development. Projects should thus be designed to propel departments forward and enhance existing offerings and foci in accordance with the role, scope, mission, and strategic priorities of the institution and current and prospective direction(s) of the affected department(s)/unit(s). Proposals should clearly indicate how project objectives are linked to the highest academic, research or training priorities of the affected department(s) and institution(s) as

well as how BoRSF investments, necessarily limited in scope and duration, will increase the capacity and quality of research, education, and/or training available to faculty and students.

B. PROJECT TYPES

1. **COMPREHENSIVE ENHANCEMENT:** These proposals provide significant enhancement to address multiple departmental priorities or holistic departmental approaches and support the institutional role, scope and mission through a variety of means. The maximum request is \$1,000,000, not to exceed \$300,000 in year one and \$200,000 in subsequent years, for projects lasting up to five years. Each eligible department/academic unit is limited to one submission, though it may also participate with other units in up to one campus-wide proposal submitted under the Multidisciplinary category. Based on budgeted funds, the expectation is for two to three Comprehensive Enhancement proposals to be awarded.
2. **TARGETED ENHANCEMENT:** These proposals provide focused enhancement that addresses a critical departmental priority and reflects the institutional role, scope and mission through a concentrated but tangibly effective effort (e. g., purchase of major equipment), with a maximum request of \$200,000 for projects lasting one year. An academic unit is not limited in number of proposals, but must provide a rank-order list of all proposals submitted on its behalf.

C. COMPETITION CATEGORIES

Proposals must be submitted to competitions for one of the following categories based on their primary purpose, though they may contain elements of all three:

1. **RESEARCH:** This competition will be for proposals that primarily seek to enhance faculty/student research in departments and institutions for which this is a defining priority.
2. **EDUCATION:** This competition will be for proposals that primarily seek to enhance graduate and/or undergraduate education in departments and institutions for which this is a defining priority.
3. **WORKFORCE:** This competition will be for proposals seeking to enhance specific programs directly associated with workforce priorities and needs in Louisiana identified, if appropriate, by the Louisiana Department of Economic Development, the Louisiana Workforce Commission, Workforce Investment Council, and/or other regional economic development entities. The in-State need driving proposal objectives must be clearly documented.

D. ELIGIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS

1. **DISCIPLINE ROTATION**

Disciplines are eligible on an annually rotating basis. Proposals will be submitted to a single competition and the majority of the enhancement provided must be to an institutional division associated with an eligible discipline in the appropriate year, as indicated by the following:

Cycle I (FYs 2017-18, 2019-20)	Cycle II (FYs 2018-19, 2020-21)
Engineering B (Industrial, Materials, Mechanical)	Engineering A (Chemical, Civil, Electrical)
Biological Sciences	Chemistry
Health and Medical Sciences	Computer and Information Sciences
Physics	Business
Social Sciences	Education
Humanities	Earth and Environmental Sciences
Agricultural Sciences	Arts
Astronomy	Mathematics
Targeted Workforce	Targeted Workforce

Multidisciplinary proposals are welcome and encouraged. Projects that establish or improve facilities that are used by multiple departments/units help to leverage funding, maximize efficiency and broaden impact. The proposal must be led by, rooted in and provide substantial enhancement to the department/academic unit associated with one of the disciplines eligible in the year of submission.

2. **ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS:** Departments/units at public two-year, four-year and special-purpose institutions, and regionally accredited independent institutions of higher education that are members of the Louisiana Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, are eligible to compete under the Departmental Enhancement Subprogram. Technical colleges are not eligible to compete except in collaboration with a two- or four-year eligible institution.

For applications that propose to share resources among several institutions, the following rules/guidelines apply:

- a. The application must be submitted by a single lead institution. Partnering institutions must be referenced on the cover page of the application under the heading "Additional Institutions."
 - b. Documentation that defines the role(s) of the partner institutions must be submitted as an appendix to the proposal.
 - c. Only one comprehensive budget page for the project may be submitted for each year of the proposal. Sub-awards for partnering institutions must be described in the budget justification and referenced in the work plan.
 - d. If awarded, the grant will be contracted with and managed fully by the lead institution.
3. **ELIGIBLE DEPARTMENTS/UNITS:** Eligibility is not restricted to traditional discipline-based departments, and includes all formally constituted (approved by the Board of Regents or formally established by the campus/system) academic, research or agricultural organizational units on the campus, including centers, multidisciplinary research groups, etc. Informal or ad hoc partnerships or collaborative groups are not eligible, though multiple formally constituted units may collaborate on a single proposal.
 4. **ELIGIBLE FACULTY:** Only faculty members of an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education may act as principal or co-principal investigators. Individuals who are not employed by an eligible Louisiana institution of higher education (e.g., out-of-state scholars, scientists and/or engineers, or employees of industry) may serve as consultants on applications; however, they may not be listed as principal or co-investigators and must not be cited on the cover page of the proposal.

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

5. **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:** Any activity is eligible as long as the applicant can argue convincingly that it is strongly linked to the submitting unit's strategic priorities and will substantially enhance the infrastructure of the particular academic, research, or agricultural department(s) or unit(s) involved.
6. **ELIGIBILITY OF DUPLICATE PROPOSALS:** The same (or a very similar) proposal may not be submitted for funding consideration in more than one category during the same cycle. Targeted Enhancement proposals that are the same (or very similar) to an individual request or section from a Comprehensive Enhancement proposal are considered to be duplicative and are, therefore, prohibited. In the event that duplicate or multiple similar

proposals are submitted in the same cycle, all affected proposals will be disqualified.

E. ACADEMIC UNIT MISSION STATEMENT

The administration of each submitting academic unit should establish a unit-wide statement that delineates goals and strategic priorities in relation to future development and relates that vision to the overall institutional mission statement. Each proposal must quote this departmental vision in the appropriate sections and establish how the proposed enhancements fit into that vision.

F. INSTITUTIONAL SCREENING COMMITTEE

Proposals must be carefully screened by an institutional committee consisting, at a minimum, of an administrator representing the academic unit, an academic officer from the administration, and a representative from the sponsored programs office. The representative of the submitting unit will necessarily change as the committee reviews proposals originating from different academic units. The committee will (1) approve the proposal for submission to the Board of Regents, (2) if it is a Targeted Enhancement proposal, include it in a list that prioritizes in rank order all Targeted Enhancement submissions by that unit in terms of how the individual proposal addresses the goals of the mission statement, and (3) ensure no conflict of interest exists (as defined in the "Code of Governmental Ethics," R. S. 1950, as amended, Title 42, Chapter 15). Upon submission, the campus sponsored programs office will include a memorandum from the committee that includes names of all committee members along with the prioritized list of proposals from that unit.

Submission of the proposal by the campus is considered a guarantee that: (1) no conflict of interest exists; (2) that the proposal has been reviewed and approved for submission to the Board by all appropriate institutional officials who are required to evaluate proposals submitted for external review, including the submitting organization's authorized fiscal officer; (3) has met the objectives, eligibility requirements, and all other appropriate criteria as set forth in this RFP; and (4) is in the format required by the Board.

G. DURATION

Comprehensive proposals may seek up to five (5) years of support with appropriate justification. Targeted proposals may seek one year of support. See Section II.B for funding limits.

H. COST SHARING AND MATCHING COMMITMENTS

Potential applicants and college/university officials should note that institutional cost-sharing commitments of any kind (e.g., institutional, private sector, federal) that are pledged in the proposal are binding and must be honored in full if the proposal is funded at the requested level. Depending upon consultants' recommendations, matching commitments may have to be honored in full even if the award level is reduced. Institutions of higher education should, therefore, make only realistic, concrete commitments that they are able to honor. Discounts on equipment purchases are not eligible for inclusion as institutional match.

Support Fund monies will not be disbursed until appropriate written assurances of all matches and cost sharing promised in the proposal have been received, reviewed and approved by Board staff. Institutional approval is granted by submission of the proposal electronically to the Board through each institution's LOGAN account and certifies that the fiscal agent is aware of the claimed commitment(s) and has determined said commitment(s) to be consistent with all applicable guidelines, regulations, and statutes. Similarly, the fiscal agent's signature, which is required on the budget page(s) of funded projects, certifies to the Board that commitments pledged in the proposal have been honored. All matching funds are subject to the same restrictions as Support Funds except as noted in the budgetary requirements in this RFP. When a full graduate fellowship or scholarship is requested from the Support Fund, the institution is required to match or remit tuition for the student during the full duration of Support Fund payments.

I. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

All proposals submitted in Departmental Enhancement will be subject to external review by an appropriate panel(s) of experts. The Board selects and engages the services of out-of-state experts in the eligible disciplines. Teams of experts representing the eligible disciplines individually assess and collectively rank proposals in the appropriate discipline, and a final panel of out-of-state scholars and/or higher education administrators will determine final recommendations for funding for all Departmental Enhancement submissions.

1. **FINAL SELECTION OF PROPOSALS TO BE FUNDED:** After recommendations from out-of-state experts are submitted, the Board makes final determinations of which proposals will be funded based on the competitive review process.
2. **DEBRIEFING:** A copy of the composite rating form for each proposal reviewed will be included in the complete consultants' report(s) published in April each year at <https://web.laregents.org> under the Downloads link. This is the only debriefing information that is available for Departmental Enhancement proposals.
3. **TIMETABLE:** Contingent upon Board and Legislative action, the following schedule for submission, assessment, and approval of grants will apply for FY 2017-18. **If deadline dates fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday, the deadlines will be extended until 4:30 p.m. Central of the next working weekday.**

July 2017	Request for proposals issued
November 1, 2017	Last day that applicants may ask questions about the RFP
November 14, 2017, 4:30 p.m. Central	Deadline for receipt of Departmental Enhancement proposals through LOGAN
November 2017 – March 2018	Proposals reviewed by out-of-state experts
April 2018	Reports and recommendations of out-of-state experts published
April 2018	Final action by the Board
May and June 2018	Contracts negotiated and executed

4. **POST-AWARD EVALUATION AND REPORTS:** The Board of Regents requires that institutions receiving monies from the Support Fund report periodically on the utilization and impact of those monies. At a minimum, annual and final Progress and Financial Status reports will be required of the awarded campus. Data and information collected for review will vary depending upon the type of activity involved, but all information necessary to assess the effectiveness of each project will be gathered. As appropriate, the services of out-of-state experts may be utilized in the evaluation process.

III. PROCEDURES AND DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

All proposals submitted to the Board must be complete upon submission and must be received electronically through LOGAN. Modules for submitting Enhancement Program proposals are available on LOGAN, which may be accessed at <https://web.laregents.org> by clicking “LOGAN” on the menu at the top. Paper originals or copies will not be accepted. Note that the proposal submission process includes two steps: submission by academic unit via the institutional screening committee to the sponsored programs office, and campus approval with submission to the Board or Regents; a proposal cannot be accepted by the Board until both steps are completed.

- A. **COMPLETION AND SUBMISSION OF MATERIALS:** Submission deadlines are absolute; all campus work on the proposal, including final approval and submission to the Board of Regents by the designated campus office, must be completed on or before the deadline date and time. The online proposal submission system is programmed to close at the deadline(s) cited in this RFP
A proposal sent to the Board of Regents through LOGAN may be released upon request of the

submitting institution if additional changes are needed, provided such request is made before the deadline for receipt. A released proposal must be resubmitted through LOGAN prior to the deadline to be eligible for funding consideration.

- B. CONFIRMATION OF RECEIPT:** After a representative from the academic unit submits the completed proposal to its designated campus office via LOGAN, he/she will receive a sequence of three emails: (1) immediately following the applicant's submission to the campus, confirmation of receipt of the electronic proposal by the campus; (2) following institution approval and submission, confirmation that the Regents have received the proposal; and (3) as soon as possible after the subprogram submission deadline, an indication of whether the proposal has been submitted in compliance with RFP instructions or disqualified for lack of compliance. The campus will be copied on all confirmations.

IV. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS AND FORMAT

All narrative sections of the proposal must be presented in a single PDF document with pages numbered, 1-inch margins at the top, bottom and on each side, and in type no smaller than 12 point. Forms must be completed and proposals submitted via LOGAN.

The format for each project type (Comprehensive and Targeted) and project category (Research, Education, and Workforce) is the same unless otherwise noted in the instructions below, though contents must be tailored to the specific project. The requirements and format must be followed closely. Proposals that do not adhere to these guidelines will be disqualified for noncompliance. Each proposal must include the following information:

- A. COVER PAGE:** Each item on the cover page must be completed. The correct project type (Comprehensive or Targeted), primary project category (Research, Education, or Workforce), and eligible discipline must be marked on the cover page. For applicants submitting under the Multidisciplinary category, "Multidisciplinary" should be marked as well as the eligible discipline that will be impacted most by the proposal. The proposal will be assigned for review based on these specifications chosen by the applicant.
- B. PROJECT SUMMARY:** The project summary, limited to 2,500 characters (including spaces), should be a concise description of the project, containing a clear statement of goals, objectives, and planned impact. It should address the aspects of the academic unit's vision statement that the proposed activities incorporate in order to provide targeted or comprehensive enhancement. A reviewer should be able to understand what is being requested, what the project intends to accomplish, and the extent of the enhancement within the initial paragraph of the summary.
- C. NARRATIVE AND BIBLIOGRAPHY:** The narrative may not exceed fifteen (15) pages for Targeted Enhancement proposals or twenty-five (25) for Departmental Enhancement. Biographical sketches, budgets, and budget justifications are not considered part of the narrative section. The narrative should be succinct and avoid repetition. Information applicable in multiple places may be referenced by title of section. Proposals that do not conform to page limitations or the prescribed outline will be disqualified.

For multi-institutional proposals, explain as appropriate in each of the following sections the multi-campus agreements relative to funding, resources, and arrangements by which the various institutions propose to share the benefits of the project and/or plans to make equipment/facilities available to other Louisiana campuses. Documentation must be provided describing the exact nature of any formal agreements related to the submitted project between/among the institutions.

- 1. THE CURRENT SITUATION:** Briefly describe the academic unit applying and how it fits into the larger institution's role, scope and mission. Support this description by providing the

data in the categories listed below according to the chosen project type. Data should be referenced as appropriate in later sections including Work Plan, Impact and Budget Justification. All requested data must be provided for the chosen project type; proposals that have impact across project types may provide data related to all applicable types if it informs the project's purpose, goals, and objectives. For proposals submitted in the Multidisciplinary category, describe the current situation for each unit being impacted in order of the level of involvement of each unit within the project. Workforce proposals should cite data from the relevant State agencies where appropriate.

a. Research Proposals

# Faculty Serving Academic Unit	Full
	Assistant
	Associate
	Other
# Faculty Research Projects Impacted	
# Student Research Projects Impacted	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
Research Dollars Received by Project Team	Amount for Last Five Years
	Awards/Funding Agencies
	Pending Awards

b. Education Proposals

# Total Course Enrollment in Unit	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
# Majors Enrolled in Academic Unit	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
# Average Annual Graduates in Unit or Related Majors (Last Five Years)	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
# Courses Impacted by Project	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate
Typical Post-Graduate Jobs for Impacted Degrees (List Job Types)	PhD
	Master's
	Undergraduate

c. Workforce Proposals

# Students Enrolled in Each Impacted Program	PhD
(Total Number-Last Five Years)	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
# Graduates from Each Impacted Program	PhD
(Total Number-Last Five Years)	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
# Students Finding Employment Post-Graduation	PhD
(Total Number-Last Five Years)	Master's
	Undergraduate
	Other
List Job Types/Titles	
Jobs in Louisiana	
Jobs Out of State	
Average Starting Salary	
Current Employment Statewide in Impacted Area(s)	
Anticipated Need: Next Five Years	
Workforce Gap	
Courses Directly Impacted by Project	

2. **MISSION STATEMENT:** Provide the submitting unit's mission statement. This statement will represent the unit as a whole and will be the same for all proposals submitted by the unit (See Section II.E). Describe how the unit's goals and strategic priorities fit into the context of the overall institutional mission statement.
3. **RATIONALE:** Summarize the need for the project and how it addresses the priorities outlined in the unit's mission statement. Describe the deficiencies in the unit's capabilities, capacity, competitiveness and expertise that the proposal will address.
4. **PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:** Define the project goals and provide measurable objectives for each one. Take care to ensure that the measurable objectives are realistic, tangible, as specific as possible, and directly related to the goals.
5. **WORK PLAN:** Describe the specific activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals and objectives described above. Indicate the person(s) who will conduct each activity. Provide a schedule of activities that lists benchmarks to be accomplished throughout the term of the project. Describe how each objective will be evaluated.
6. **IMPACT:** Describe the impact of the project on the academic unit by citing specific data relative to the proposal goals. The level of description provided for each of the following sections will vary based on the proposal's chosen category: Research, Education or Workforce. Data in the Current Situation section should be referenced to provide specific details on impact. Though it is understood that some proposals will employ aspects of two or more categories, take care to provide the highest level of justification for the sections directly related to the chosen project type. For any proposal section that falls outside of the planned activities and enhancement, simply respond with "not applicable".
 - a. **Impact on Existing Resources:** Describe the manner and the extent to which the project will complement and improve upon the existing resources of the department/unit(s), and, if, applicable, the campus.
 - b. **Impact on Curriculum and Instruction:** Explain the impact which the proposed project will have on the variety and quality of curricular offerings and instructional methods within

- the affected unit(s).
- c. **Impact on Research Capacity:** Illustrate how the project will elevate the unit's ability to perform significant research and how it will improve competitiveness for research funding. Provide specific data for the project's impact on research by current and potential faculty, students, additional campus units, and regional/national programs.
 - d. **Impact on Workforce Development:** Describe how the project will increase the workforce competitiveness of graduates and provide specific data that indicate the regional or Statewide workforce needs that the project addresses. Workforce proposals are expected to provide data from State agencies that demonstrate how the project is addressing Louisiana's workforce priorities and needs.
 - e. **Impact on Faculty Development:** Explain how the project will improve and expand faculty expertise in research, education and/or workforce development.
 - f. **Impact on Service of Students:** Explain how the proposed project will impact and improve the student experience. Describe how the proposal will increase the unit(s)' capacity for student learning and training. Demonstrate how the project increases opportunities for students post-graduation by aligning student learning/training with workforce opportunities. Provide evidence of the project's impact on the ability of the participating unit(s) to attract, retain and graduate students of high quality.
 - g. **Economic Impact:** Describe the short- and long-term benefits of the project to Louisiana's economic development. Explain how the proposal will impact the unit's or institution's relationship with industrial sponsors. For projects with significant potential academic/cultural contributions or from which a direct economic benefit is not expected, explain the manner in which the proposed project will contribute to and benefit the academic and/or cultural resources of Louisiana.
7. **PHYSICAL ENHANCEMENTS:** The purpose of this section is to establish the precise relationship between the work plan and the item(s) of equipment or other physical enhancements requested. Each item should be referenced above as necessary as it relates to goals, work plan and impact, but described in detail in this section.
- a. **Equipment Request:** List each item requested, with cost information, and briefly indicate the manner in which each major equipment item will be utilized within the work plan. Logical groupings of items should be made. Explain the reasoning behind (1) choosing each particular piece of equipment and (2) the alternatives that were considered and rejected relative to price, quality and appropriate fit for the academic unit going forward.
 - b. **Other Physical Enhancements:** Describe in detail non-equipment items to be purchased and the significance of the items to the project.
 - c. **Equipment and Facilities on Hand for Project:** Itemize and briefly explain major equipment/facilities on hand that will be used in conjunction with requested purchases to enhance the academic unit. This section should answer the question: "Has there been a thorough survey of the current equipment/facilities inventory and does the proposal plan to make full use of it?"
 - d. **Equipment Housing, Maintenance and Security:** Describe a reasonable plan to house and maintain the equipment and other physical property that ensures its maximum usable lifetime. Please note that Support Fund monies cannot be used to maintain equipment, whether existing or purchased, through the award. Support Funds cannot be requested to purchase service contracts, warranties or maintenance agreements beyond the life of the grant. These items should be funded through institutional or other match. If multidisciplinary, interdepartmental, or interinstitutional use of physical property is proposed, describe the plan for effective utilization relative to each academic unit involved. Describe the plan for keeping all items secure and accounted for at all times.
8. **EVALUATION:** Devise a plan for the entire project that will assess/evaluate the project and the degree to which it has achieved its goal(s), as well as its contributions to the unit, campus

and State. Where possible use tangible and specific indicators.

- 9. SUSTAINABILITY:** Describe the academic unit's plan for ensuring that the impact and individual budget requests (including equipment, software, supplies, and funds dedicated to staff, faculty and graduate students) of the project are sustainable beyond the life of the grant. Issues such as equipment repair, maintenance, salary support for new hires or released faculty, etc., should be addressed. Sustainability is considered to be a fundamental element of Departmental Enhancement and preference will be given to projects that both strategically enhance an academic unit based on a sound vision, and have a concrete, realistic plan for sustaining the improvements. If activities are not intended to be sustained, explain why and justify the investment of limited Support Funds for temporary activities.
- 10. FACULTY AND STAFF EXPERTISE:** Identify the individuals who will conduct and administer the project, define their roles, and provide their qualifications for undertaking the specific responsibilities assigned to them. Special attention should be given to the Principal Investigator. Note: A Biographical Sketch form must be completed in a separate section for the Project Director and other involved senior personnel. (See Section IV.F below.)
- D. PREVIOUS BoR SUPPORT FUND AWARDS:** List all awards received from any Support Fund program during the previous five (5) years by the academic unit. Include the following information in this summary statement: (1) Principal Investigator's name, type of award, amount of award, and period of support; (2) title of the project; (3) a summary of project results; and (4) how the current proposal is related to the previous award(s).
- E. CURRENT AND PENDING SUPPORT:** Complete the form for the Principal Investigator and all senior personnel.
- F. BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH:** Provide information necessary for reviewers to evaluate the capabilities and experience of key personnel. The Biographical Sketch form must be completed for the Principal Investigator and all senior project personnel. Regarding publications, biographical sketches should only include relevant books, peer-reviewed publications, and manuscripts formally accepted for publication. Works in progress or submitted for publication should not be included.
- G. BUDGET AND BUDGET NARRATIVE/JUSTIFICATION:** Complete an itemized budget form for each year of the project and submit it in the appropriate LOGAN section. A corresponding budget narrative will be uploaded separately, which should fully describe every item for which the expenditure of Support Funds is requested and institutional/private match monies are committed and indicate its significance to the project. All funds for which a commitment from an external source has been pledged and that are cited in the narrative section of the proposal must be listed on the budget page and explained in the budget narrative. Matching funds must be specified as "in cash" or "in kind." Use State contract prices for equipment purchases, if applicable.

V. DISALLOWED BUDGETARY ITEMS

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

Panels will then be asked to develop recommendations relative to whether providing Support Fund money for specific proposals under serious consideration would violate this Constitutional stipulation. Indirect costs may not be requested from the Departmental Enhancement Subprogram, but may be provided as institutional match.

Enhancement Program funds may not be requested for maintenance or repair of equipment, whether existing or purchased through the Support Fund. Long-term maintenance contracts for equipment cannot be requested from the Support Fund; these expenses may be provided as match.

Applicants should also note that the scope of the program does not permit: (1) construction of facilities; (2) routine renovation or upgrading; (3) paying faculty from the submitting university to train other faculty at the same university, or faculty at other universities who are a part of an multi-institutional project; (4) purchase of standard motorized vehicles such as cars, vans, boats, etc.; or (5) purchase of standard office furniture or routine office equipment (e.g., copiers, desk chairs). Support Fund money may be requested to furnish specialized office equipment and vehicles for educational and research purposes and essential to the success of a particular project (e.g., remote tables for computer work stations or unmanned aerial research vehicles for data collection). The proposal must detail and fully justify the specific educational and/or research uses of the requested equipment as related to project goals, objectives and activities.

Equipment and supplies purchased with Support Fund monies may not be given to grant participants (faculty, students, teachers, etc.) as personal property during or after the grant period. Support Fund money may not be requested for equipment or other expenditures, such as faculty stipends, additional compensation, or overload pay, for K-12 teachers or Louisiana Technical College partners. These individuals are eligible for funds through the BESE portion of the Support Fund, so may not receive BoRSF monies. (See also Section VI. below.)

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

Support may not be requested for shortfalls or deficits in budgets, scholarships or tuition, augmentation of salaries of individuals pursuing regularly assigned duties, or unspecified contingencies; and finally, funds may not be requested for anticipated centers or institutes that require Board approval prior to their establishment and that have not been approved prior to submission of the proposal.

Any item deemed ineligible shall not be funded, regardless of the recommendations of the external consultants.

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

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

VI. FUNDS FOR PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL

Except in compelling and unusual circumstances, BoRSF funds may not be requested for faculty or staff support. If the Project Director feels strongly that such expenditures are warranted, partial salary support may be requested as release time in proportion to the amount of time each affected employee is

expected to contribute to the project, and may not exceed 25% of academic-year salary plus two months of summer support. Support may be provided only as release time or summer salary and in no event may charges to the Support Fund exceed the percentage share of base salary pledged to the project. Faculty and staff may not receive stipends, overload pay or additional compensation for work performed outside of regular duties or work hours, and may not be paid on a contract basis as consultants to a funded project.

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 through Support Funds. In addition, the budget narrative must provide detailed explanations of the type of salary requested, regular salary level, percentage of effort committed, campus guarantee of appropriate release, and justification in terms of project work to be performed for each individual requesting support. Institutions may provide salary support and additional compensation through in-cash or in-kind match.

While requests may be made to fund a full- or part-time faculty or staff position, such requests require substantial justification and a firm commitment from the submitting institution to continue the position after the award period ends or a persuasive case that the staff work will not be necessary after the grant period. The applicant should specify a duration that the position will be needed to fulfill the long-term goals of the campus, department/unit and/or project. Staff positions created to implement the award must serve a longer-term need met by hiring new individual(s), even on a limited basis, and may not be requested solely to support the grant.

VII. FUNDS FOR STUDENT SUPPORT

Support may be requested for graduate and/or undergraduate students either working on the project or to be provided with fellowship or scholarship support aligned with project goals and objectives. Such support must be at a level appropriate to recruit and/or retain superior students in the unit and must yield a benefit beyond the individual student awarded funds. Funds requested should be justified in reference to support packages offered to similar students enrolled in the same or similar degree program. The budget should delineate the maximum award per year, the period covered per year (e.g., academic or calendar year), and the total period for which a student will be supported. Support may not exceed the total intended duration of the degree program (e.g., four years for a baccalaureate or doctoral degree).

Support Fund money may not be requested to pay tuition or fringe benefits for graduate or undergraduate students. In cases in which a student is employed for summer work but not enrolled during the summer term, required federal payments may be requested for the student as a research assistant or similar. Tuition and fringe benefits for graduate and/or undergraduate students may be provided as part of the institutional match. When a full graduate fellowship or scholarship is requested from the Support Fund, the institution is required to match or remit tuition for the student during the full duration of Support Fund payments (See Section II.G).

VIII. PROJECT ACTIVATION DATE AND ANTICIPATED DATE OF COMPLETION

The project activation date is June 1, 2018 and the termination date for Targeted Enhancement projects is June 30, 2019. Comprehensive Enhancement proposals may request up to five years of support with a final possible termination date of June 30, 2023. No-cost extensions may be requested to complete activities per Louisiana R.S. 39:1514. This statute specifies that “contracts or amendments to existing contracts issued to institutions of higher education under the authority of the Board of Regents to award grants for educational purposes with funds available from the Louisiana Education Quality Support Fund, the Louisiana Fund, and the Health Excellence Fund may be entered into for periods of not more than six years. However, such contracts may be extended beyond the six-year limit up to an additional two-year period provided no additional costs are incurred.” Extensions to Enhancement awards are limited to a maximum of two (2) years.

Appendix A

Departmental Enhancement Rating Form

Departmental Enhancement Rating Form

Goals/Objectives 10 Points _____

-To what degree are the goals clearly stated, reasonable, achievable, and related to the mission statement of the academic unit? To what degree are the objectives measurable and related to the goals?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Work Plan 20 Points _____

-To what degree does the proposal establish a compelling timeline for grant activities with a clear delineation of which team member is responsible for each task? To what degree does the work plan clearly establish the necessary tasks for achieving the project goals and objectives?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Impact 30 points _____

-To what degree does the project elevate the unit's ability to perform significant research, compete for research funding, improve facilities or curriculum in a way that impacts recruitment, retention, and the workforce competitiveness of graduates? To what degree is this impact related to the mission statement of the academic unit?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Evaluation 10 Points _____

-To what degree is a plan established for evaluating the impact of the project with criteria based on specific metrics?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Sustainability **10 Points** _____

-To what degree are the goals, impact and individual budget requests sustainable beyond the life of the grant? To what degree are maintenance or sustainability plans established for equipment, software, supplies, as well as funds dedicated to staff, faculty and graduate students?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Investigators **10 Points** _____

-To what degree do the team members appear capable of implementing the work plan?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses

Budget **10 Points** _____

-To what degree is the budget efficiently crafted to maximize the project's impact? To what degree does the budget justification clearly explain the relationship of each individual request to the proposal's impact, goals and work plan?

Comments:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses