

Marty J. Chabert
Chair

Collis B. Temple III
Vice Chair

Blake R. David
Secretary

Kim Hunter Reed, Ph.D.
Commissioner of
Higher Education



Claudia H. Adley
Randy L. Ewing
Robert W. Levy
Charles R. McDonald
Darren G. Mire
Sonia A. Pérez
Wilbert D. Pryor
T. Jay Seale III
Gary N. Solomon, Jr.
Gerald J. Theunissen
Felix R. Weill
Jacqueline V. Wyatt
William S. Jewell, Student

BOARD OF REGENTS

P. O. Box 3677
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3677
Phone (225) 342-4253, FAX (225) 342-9318
www.regents.la.gov

November 21, 2019

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Members, ATLAS Final Review Panel

FROM: Carrie S. Robison, Deputy Commissioner for Sponsored Programs

RE: Review Process, 2019-20

Thank you for agreeing to assist us in the year's review of proposals submitted for funding consideration in the Awards to Louisiana Artists and Scholars (ATLAS) Program of the Louisiana Board of Regents Support Fund. We consider ourselves extremely fortunate that a person of your expertise and credibility is willing to participate in what we consider a critically important endeavor.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

In the fall of 1986, Louisiana's constitution was amended to establish in the State treasury two funds: the Louisiana Educational Quality Trust Fund (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund or LEQTF) and the Louisiana Educational Quality Support Fund (subsequently renamed the Board of Regents Support Fund and hereinafter referred to as the Support Fund). The Trust Fund was established with approximately \$550 million received in settlement of the State's offshore drilling dispute with the Federal government, and the Support Fund was established with 75% of the interest earned from the investment of monies in the Trust Fund and 75% of any recurring revenues. The remaining interest earned on the Trust Fund, as well as the remaining 25% of recurring revenues, are returned to the Trust Fund until it reaches \$2 billion. Only Support Fund monies are available for annual appropriation by the Legislature.

On an annual basis the interest earnings in the Support Fund are divided equally between the Board of Regents to enhance higher education and the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education to enhance vocational-technical, secondary, middle and elementary education. According to the constitutional amendment, the funds available to higher education from the Support Fund are to be utilized to enhance economic development and to support four types of activities: (1) endowment of chairs for eminent scholars; (2) enhancement of academic departments and units at universities (primarily through the purchase of research and instructional equipment); (3) recruitment of superior graduate students; and (4) research and development efforts across all disciplines and at all levels.

ATLAS GOALS AND PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS:

The Board of Regents ATLAS Program has been designed to provide an opportunity for established faculty in arts, humanities, and social sciences disciplines to complete major academic and creative projects with the potential to have a broad impact on a regional and/or national level. Please consult the request for proposals (RFP), provided to you on the review webpage, to understand the eligibility requirements, for faculty and for project activities, of the program. The determination of eligibility for ATLAS funds should be made by reviewers and in the event that a

project is deemed ineligible, the reasons for such a determination should be clearly stated within the review materials.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THIS FUNDING CYCLE:

Proposals were solicited in all social sciences, humanities, and arts disciplines. Posted on the review webpage are lists of proposals submitted for funding consideration. The summaries, including both all proposals submitted and separate summaries by discipline, list the proposals by project title, institution, principal investigator(s), and funds requested. The subject-area category and discipline into which each applicant submitted his or her proposal is indicated by the abbreviation located underneath the proposal number on these summary pages. We anticipate being able to fund between eight and ten of these proposals with the approximately \$350,000 available to ATLAS in this fiscal year.

THE REVIEW PROCESS:

To conduct as thorough and objective a review as possible on this number of applications within our monetary constraints and timeframe (all new research contracts must be executed prior to June 30, 2020), a two-phase review process has been adopted. Reviewers at both stages will be provided with the same review criteria for the program, and the Board emphasizes that these factors should form the basis for funding recommendations.

A. Phase I: In-Depth Review by Subject-Area Panel

In Phase I of the review process the proposals are assigned to one of three subject-area panels. These panels are comprised of broadly knowledgeable experts able to judge the proposals submitted in their general fields of expertise. The chair of each subject-area panel will serve on the final panel as the representative of the subject area, and work with other panel chairs to determine final rankings and funding recommendations.

In this phase of the review process, each subject-area panel is charged with providing in-depth evaluations of the merits of those proposals submitted in that subject area. The subject-area reviewer responsibilities are as follows:

1. The panel chair, in discussion with the panel members, assigns each member a portion of the proposals for which he/she acts as “primary discussant.”
2. This primary reviewer reads each assigned proposal, completes a detailed written critique for each proposal, and prepares to discuss its relative merits/shortcomings with other panel members.
3. Through a telephone or video conference, the subject-area panel members jointly rank the proposals in the order in which they believe the proposals should be funded. The in-depth critiques must reflect this ranking.
4. The subject-area panels also examine the budgets of proposals ranked in the top 20% and develop recommendations for reductions where appropriate. When cuts are made, reviewers should briefly explain the rationale. The program has very limited resources, and reviewers are encouraged to consider the needs of the project seriously in analyzing budget requests.

B. Phase II: Final Panel Review

In Phase II of the review process, a final panel of three out-of-state experts will convene via telephone conference to discuss and compare the various groups of proposals and, ultimately, to determine the rankings of all proposals across subject areas and develop final funding recommendations.

INSTRUCTIONS TO FINAL PANEL MEMBERS:

Subject-area reports will be forwarded in advance of the teleconference. Please note that the final panel will consider only those proposals which were recommended for funding by the subject-area panels. The final panel's charge is to develop a single rank order for those proposals recommended by the subject-area panels and a set of funding stipulations for submission to the Board of Regents. Proposals not recommended for funding need not be ranked and will be listed in proposal number order in the final report.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT AND PAYMENT OF HONORARIUM:

A contract, along with an invoice and W-9 form, will be sent under separate cover. If you have any questions about your contract, please let me know as soon as possible so that appropriate adjustments can be made. If you have no problems with the contract we would appreciate your signing the contract, invoice, and W-9, writing your social security number in the appropriate places, and returning all three documents to us as soon as possible. It is not necessary to have the contract notarized. We must also have a copy of your current curriculum vitae for our contract files. We cannot pay you for professional services rendered until we receive these documents.

REQUEST FOR CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM:

Although we do not want to add to the work load you have so kindly agreed to assume by participating in this review process, any written suggestions which you could give us for improving the administration of the program and the review process are appreciated. These comments will be seriously considered as we prepare for future competitions.

Thank you again for your invaluable assistance to us in what we consider a very important endeavor. We are aware that the success of this and all Board of Regents initiatives is due, in large part, to the professional and technical expertise of the highly qualified and dedicated individuals who participate in the review process. If you have questions or suggestions, please contact me at (225) 342-4253 or carrie.robison@laregents.edu.