

Guidelines for

South Carolina
Technology **Grant Program**
(TGP)
FY 2002-2003

Entry Deadline:
October 15, 2002
5 P.M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Program Authority, Allowable Activities, and Goals	3
Priority for Funding and Nature of Awards	4
Institutional Eligibility Requirements	4
More Information: Web Site	5
Guidelines for Preparation of Proposals	5
Award Requirements	5
Letter of Intent and Nominations for Reviewers	5
Internal and External Institutional Review Processes for Proposals	6
Proposal Selection Criteria	6-7
Eligible Expenses	7-8
Accountability Requirements	8
Contents of the Proposals	8
Cover Page, Abstract, Narrative	8
Proposal Budget Page and Narrative	9
Senior Personnel Salaries	9
Other personnel Salaries and Wages	9
Fringe Benefits	9
Equipment (to be purchased)	10
Travel	10
Participant Support Costs	10
Other Direct Costs	10
Subcontracts	10
Facilities and Equipment (available)	10
Appendix	10
General Information	11
Submission Guidelines	11
Checklist Form for Proposal Submission	12
Proposal Forms	13-14
Proposal Budget Forms	15-16
Letter of Intent Forms	17-19
Suggested Reviewers Form	20-21

Program Authority, Allowable Activities, and Goals

Section 59-150-355 of the South Carolina Code of Laws (1976), as amended by the South Carolina General Assembly in 2002 with HB 4879, provides for the appropriation of funds for the University Technology Grant Program (TGP) from the South Carolina Lottery. This amendment states that “Grants must be awarded to institutions with grant proposals supporting the development of technology and/or technology infrastructure” in the ten four-year teaching universities of South Carolina. Any of the following technologically-related activities are permissible under the TGP:

- Connectivity among and within institutions
- Upgrade
- Hardware
- Software
- Management
- Maintenance
- Installation
- Training

Success in the use of these funds will be measured by outcomes significantly increasing access to automated databases and technology by students, faculty, and staff for the improvement of teaching and learning processes and student-centered administrative processes at public institutions of higher education. Examples of areas of improving teaching and learning processes include:

- Access to sophisticated information and full-text databases, new library management systems, library interconnectivity and other elements essential to a virtual library
- Distance education technologies and infrastructures
- Voice-over internet protocols (VoIP)
- Document management systems (for capturing, indexing and finding documents for use in classroom teaching)
- Classroom monitoring systems
- Establishment of “smart” classrooms
- Expansion, upgrade, establishment of laptop or computer laboratories

Examples of improving student-centered administrative processes might include the following illustrations:

- Development of “wireless” technology environments
- Technologically-based course management systems
- On-line advising systems in South Carolina’s public higher education system
- On-line admissions, registration, and/or transfer credit evaluation and systems

- On-line interinstitutional library catalogues and library borrowing

Priority for Funding and Nature of Awards

Priority

The **TGP** will accord priority status for funding to proposals in the following categories in descending order:

- From individual institutions which have well-conceived, integrated plans for the implementation of basic technology infrastructure projects designed to make significant enhancement in teaching and learning.
- From a consortium to fund the teaching sector's contribution to the multi-institutional virtual library project with the proposal designed so that it could incorporate research and two-year sector institutions (which might finance their participation in such a project from the centers of excellence and technology funds, respectively), as well as private institutions (which would contribute their own funding.)
- From institutional consortia which can show reasonable opportunities for assuring greater fiscal efficiencies and enhancements in teaching and learning processes through statewide technological systems for all participating public institutions.

In view of the widespread need for immediate support of technological development across the teaching universities, the terms of the award will not exceed one year. However, any unspent funds at the end of that year may be carried over for expenditure in the following fiscal year in accordance with the budgets of the funded proposals.

Size and Number of Awards

Grant proposals submitted should total at least \$100,000. Recognizing that significant expenditures are necessary to promote substantive and systemic change in teaching and learning, the **average award is anticipated to range from \$500,000 to \$800,000**. No more than two (2) awards per institution in the FY 2002-2003 year will be made. However, this limitation does not preclude an institution from being party to any successful consortial proposal.

Institutional Eligibility Requirements

All ten public four-year teaching universities in South Carolina are eligible for funding under this program. Awards will be made to institutions rather than to individual faculty members. Statewide consortial projects are encouraged but basic projects will receive priority for funding. In the case of a consortial proposal, only one public institution or state agency may be named as the fiduciary agent.

More Information: Web Site

For more information about legislative authorization for this grant and on-line access to a web-based application packet for the **TGP**, consult the Commission's web site at www.che400.state.sc.us. Click on "Academic Affairs and Licensing" and then click on "**Technology Grant Program (TGP) Information.**"

Guidelines for Preparation of Proposals

Award Requirements for FY 2002-2003

The **TGP** seeks to promote the quality and breadth of technology available to the students, faculty, and staff of public higher education institutions and to citizens of South Carolina through the state's public teaching universities. Areas listed above under "Program Authority, Allowable Activities and Goals" are illustrative, but not exhaustive, of those expected to be addressed in grant proposals which will receive favorable consideration through the review process.

Successful grant proposals should contain significant amounts of funding for faculty, staff, and/or student training. The review process will favorably consider any project for funding if it offers through technology a substantial promise to contribute toward better quality in and access to teaching and learning and evidence of avoidance of unnecessary costs.

Letter of Intent and Nominations for Reviewers

A letter of intent will be due 30 days before the proposals themselves are due. The forms for the letter of intent are found at the end of this document.

Five potential reviewers with state, regional, or national prominence and experience who are experts in the technology area appropriate to the proposal may be nominated from each institution or consortium for each proposal they intend to submit. In nominating persons as reviewers, care must be taken to avoid any possible conflict of interest, e.g., co-publisher in the last five years, dissertation advisor, business or financial partner, potential vendor, and any others with whom the institution or project director may have had a business or purchasing arrangement. Potential reviewers will be disqualified if they have been contacted by the institution or consortium applying for the grant. Names, complete addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses of potential reviewers should be provided on the form provided and submitted with the Letter of Intent. At the end of that form, applicants may list the names(s) of any individual(s) whom they would prefer not to review their proposal.

Internal Institutional Review Process for Proposals

To assure the quality of proposals received for this competition and to assure that proposals are in keeping with institutional development priorities, all proposals sent to the Commission must first have undergone an internal institutional review process. The internal institutional review processes will:

- Identify the strongest proposals internally for achieving consortial or institutional priorities.
- Limit the institution to transmit to the Commission not more than two (2) institutional proposals.
- Assure that all proposals sent to the Commission have been reviewed and approved by, at a minimum, the Project Director, the Chief Academic Officer, and the sponsored program officer of the institution.

External Review Process of Proposals

An institution must submit its proposals by October 15, 2002, at 5 p.m. for consideration of the external review.

Proposals will be evaluated by a review panel appointed by the Division of Academic Affairs and Licensing of the Commission on Higher Education. Nominations for the review panel are solicited in the proposal application process. ***Nominees should be persons with expertise in the field without professional or family ties to the ten four-year public teaching universities in South Carolina. These persons may include nonresidents of South Carolina and employees of South Carolina state agencies with expertise in the field (e.g., the Research and Planning division of the Office of the State Chief Information Officer), but should not include representatives from South Carolina's public or private institutions of higher education. Technological experts in the private sector in South Carolina without a direct interest in the sales, installation, or maintenance of technological systems are also eligible for service as external reviewers.*** The Commission expects to notify recipients of their awards in early January, 2003.

Proposal Selection Criteria

All proposals meeting the test of eligibility will be reviewed by the review panel using the following general categories for evaluation:

- ❖ Institutional and systemic need.
- ❖ Likelihood that the proposal can be accomplished, based on the soundness of the proposed approach, and adequacy and appropriateness of available resources.

- ❖ Merit of the proposal, based on the likelihood that the project's outcomes will lead to better teaching, better learning, and/or better service for students, faculty, staff, and South Carolina residents.

Specific criteria to be considered for selection of proposals for funding are listed below. Each criterion will be weighted equally. The maximum score for each criterion is 10.

1. Relevance of proposal to the institution's mission and to strengthen its basic grid of technology.
2. Strength and breadth of institutional support for the proposal, including commitment of resources and support from relevant units and personnel, e.g., vice president for academic affairs, technology officer, etc.
3. Feasibility of the proposal for effective utilization by faculty, students, and staff members through inclusion of appropriate levels of training.
4. Effectiveness of the proposal for contributing to statewide goals in higher education as described in the CHE *Higher Education Strategic Plan: 2002*.
5. Possibilities of the proposal for seamless interfacing with other public institutions' (or, at least, one other institution's) higher education technology infrastructure for providing economies of scale and/or qualitative improvements in technology for teaching and learning.
6. Demonstration of evaluation component for the project after implementation.
7. Supportive data to show either substantial cost avoidance or savings through the use of the proposed technological innovation as compared with current and alternative future scenarios.
8. Potential of the project to reach and serve populations which have been either historically unserved or underserved.
9. Potential of the project to improve quality in teaching, learning, and service through better access to and use of higher education information resources.
10. Potential of the project to make South Carolina competitive with other states in providing access to knowledge bases for students and/or in increasing recent graduates' employment in high-tech fields within South Carolina.

Proposals will be ranked and funded in order (with those proposals evaluated by the review panel as meeting one of the priorities described on page 4 of these *Guidelines* being given preference for funding) until all funds are awarded.

Eligible Expenses

Funds awarded under the **TGP** may be used for support of any of the following activities in order to develop technology or enhance technological infrastructure:

- Project design and evaluation (including the use of expert consultants)
- Travel for purposes of training
- Software packages
- Equipment or equipment systems developed using component parts

- Assistance to provide release time for the Project Director, or release time or summer salary for the Project Director, faculty members, or staff members.
- Training costs which are needed for faculty, staff, or students to develop or implement new technology systems or technology-delivered courses or programs. Such training costs include supplies necessary for the training and expert consultants.

Under the **TGP** no funding is allowable for indirect costs at institutions.

Accountability Requirements

Institutions will be required to submit final narrative and financial reports three months after conclusion of the project. The narrative section of the final report must include a summary of the project's original objectives and an evaluation assessment to measure to what extent these were accomplished.

Typically, the receiving institution will be expected to expend all funds within the fiscal year when it was awarded. However, carry forward of unexpended funds can take place in a second, consecutive fiscal year in accordance with the proposed project budget, if approved in advance by the Commission's Division of Academic Affairs and Licensing.

Multi-year proposals are not allowable under **TGP**. However, in a future year, another grant for similar or identical or ongoing activities as for a first-round funded proposal will be eligible for consideration for additional funding.

An institution which does not complete the project within the approved time period allowed under these *Guidelines* will be required to return the full amount of allocated funds.

Contents of the Proposal

1. Cover Page. Use the form provided with this Request for Proposals.
2. Abstract. Provide a one-page (single-spaced, 12 font type, standard 1 inch margins) summary of the project's need, mechanism to develop and implement it, and amount requested from CHE to do so.
3. Narrative. In a maximum of five double-spaced pages (maximum 26 lines per page, 12 font type) include a) need to be addressed; b) audience to be directly served; c) institutional capacity for and commitment to the project (with administrators' letters of support as part of the appendix); d) project design plan; e) project evaluation plan; f) project schedule/timeline; g) key development personnel necessary.

The proposal narrative should identify briefly key personnel necessary for the project, but specific experience-based resumes (maximum of one-page) should appear only in the appendix.

4. Proposal Budget Page and Narrative. The budget page included with this Request for Proposals is to be used. In a short narrative that accompanies the budget page, explain the basis for major cost items, how they relate to the proposed activities of the project, and specific elements of the institutional contribution to the project. For each of the project personnel, indicate how salary or wages were derived as well as the fringe benefits formulae consistent with institutional policies. Consulting services internal to the institution may be included in the budget with unit costs described. Use of external consultants must be justified. Institutional policies should apply to both Supplies and Expenses items and Travel. Eligible equipment purchases may accordingly need to be included under an S & E or Other Direct Costs.

Budget Information

Proposals must include a budget in the format provided. Funds may be requested under any of the categories listed so long as the item and amount are necessary, reasonable, and allocable to the proposed project. All dollar figures must be rounded to the nearest hundred. ***Indirect costs are not allowed, but may be identified as an institutional contribution to the project.*** Information on budget preparation is provided below. In addition to the budget form, up to two pages of budget justification and explanation may be included.

Salaries and Wages: Requested salaries must be consistent with the institution's regular practices.

- **Senior personnel: Salaries for faculty release time for up to two months of salary are allowable;** extra compensation/supplemental salary is not allowable. Show amount of time and effort of all senior personnel being paid by the grant.
- **Other personnel:** Includes postdoctoral associates, graduate and undergraduate students, technicians, other professionals. In the budget justification section, include an explanation of the role in the project of each person listed. Show amount of time each is being paid by the grant.

Fringe Benefits: Fringe benefit amounts and rates of personnel paid on the grant must be consistent with the institution's regular practice.

Equipment: For purposes of these proposals equipment is defined as an item of property that has an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more and an expected service life of more than one year. Allowable items also include component parts of a system of equipment which together have an acquisition cost of \$5000 or more and an expected

service life of more than one year. Items of needed equipment must be listed individually with description and estimated cost, including tax, and adequately justified.

Travel: Travel and its relationship to the proposed activities must be justified as explicitly related to training. Only travel for training purposes and within the continental US is allowable.

Participant Support Costs: Costs in this category will be unusual, but if appropriate, include costs of transportation, per diem, stipends, and other related costs. Discuss the relevance to the project in the Budget Justification section.

Other Direct Costs: Other costs necessary to carry out the project may include supplies and materials, consultants, subcontracts, service fees, and computer costs. For the costs in each line item provide a clear explanation in relationship to the project. The following line items require additional information:

- Consultants: Information on each consultant must include the expertise, organization affiliation, daily compensation rate, number of days of expected service, and travel expenses. Include in the appendix a letter from the proposed consultant agreeing to the conditions of the work.

Subcontracts: Subcontractors must be identified in the proposal in order to receive the necessary CHE prior approval. Each subcontract must contain a complete budget and scope of work signed by an official authorized to commit the organization. Collaborative work with another institution may be reflected as a subcontract.

Facilities and Equipment: Describe briefly the resources that are directly available to the Project Director and relevant to the proposed project. Identify other facilities or equipment that may be used in the performance of the project. All relevant state regulations regarding vendors, purchases, and leasing must be followed by the institution or consortium submitting a proposal. This section will assist the reviewers in assessing the adequacy of resources needed to conduct the project.

Note: Institutions will waive indirect costs for these projects.

5. Appendix. All information necessary for the review of the proposal should be contained in the sections noted above. Other information, such as the one-page summary of the expertise/experience of particular personnel related to the project or the contractor's commitment letter may be included in the Appendix, but should not be used to circumvent page limitations for the proposal. It may be appropriate to supply one or two letters of support for the project, but the total material appended may not exceed five pages.

GENERAL INFORMATION

- ❖ **Final Project Report:** Within 90 days after the expiration of the grant, the Project Director is required to submit a brief (1-3 pages) project report. Include a section that shows how the funded project under the **TGP** has been used to achieve the goals for building infrastructure and enhancing capacity through technology in order to increase access and quality in teaching and learning as described in the proposal. **Additional instructions and report due dates will be issued after the CHE award letter.**
- ❖ **Final Expenditure Report:** The institution is asked to submit to CHE a final expenditure report at the same time as the narrative evaluation (i.e., within 90 days of the expiration of the grant.)
- ❖ Any inventions, patents, and/or copyrights developed under this program will remain the property of the institution or consortium to which the grant has been awarded.
- ❖ It is the responsibility of the institution or the consortium to ensure that institutional requirements have been observed both for the safety of humans involved in the project and for the absence of biohazards in the project's design and implementation.

Submission Guidelines

Except for any letter or form with a signature, the body of the proposal must be submitted via the Internet as a Word document. The cover letter must be signed and dated by the Project Director, the Chief Academic Officer of the institution, and the official from the Sponsored Programs office of the institution authorized to commit the institution to the grant competition. (For consortial proposals, the institution/agency acting as fiduciary agent must provide this cover page.) Letters and forms requiring a signature may be sent through the U.S. or state inter-agency mail services.

All signed cover pages, any signed letters, and the body of the proposal must be received not later than 5 p.m. (as noted on the CHE's Internet log) on October 15, 2002, for the 2002-2003 funds available.

CHECKLIST FORM FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

A complete proposal submitted under the South Carolina Technology Grant Program (TGP) program consists of 1) a hard-copy sent by U.S. or interagency mail of the cover page with the required signatures and (for consortial proposals) signed letters from all participating institutional/system CEOs; and 2) a WORD copy of all other parts of the completed proposal delivered by e-mail in the order below. **This Checklist should be checked in all parts and precede the WORD document.**

_____ Cover Page (with required signatures; WORD document will contain typed names and titles only for the required personnel who sign)

_____ Table of Contents

_____ Project Summary (1 page)

_____ Project Description (maximum 5 pages)

_____ Biographical Sketches (1-2 paragraphs of relevant information per senior personnel working on this project.)

_____ Summary Budget (form provided)

_____ Appendices (all consortial proposals must include a letter of support from every CEO of institution or system participating.)

_____ (Copy of this Checklist page)

DEADLINE to be received at the CHE offices:

October 15, 2002 by 5:00 pm

Mail or hand deliver signature page to:

**South Carolina Technology Grant Program (TGP)
SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
DIVISION OF ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND LICENSING
1333 MAIN STREET, SUIT 200
COLUMBIA, SC 29201**

And

E-Mail WORD COPY to: Dr. R. Lynn Kelley

lkelly@che400.state.sc.us

PROPOSAL COVER PAGE

SOUTH CAROLINA TECHNOLOGY GRANT PROGRAM (TGP) PROPOSAL

<u>CHE PROPOSAL NUMBER:</u> (To be assigned by CHE)	<u>AMOUNT REQUESTED:</u> (Round to nearest hundred dollars)
<u>SPECIFIC PROJECT FOCUS:</u> -	
<u>PROJECT START DATE:</u>	<u>PROJECT END DATE:</u>
<u>NAME OF INSTITUTION or CONSORTIUM:</u> -	<u>DEPARTMENT:</u>
<u>TITLE OF PROPOSED PROJECT:</u> -	
<u>PROJECT DIRECTOR:</u> (Name and Title)	<u>SIGNATURE</u>
<u>ADDRESS:</u> - -	
<u>CO-PROJECT DIRECTORS:</u> (Name and Title)	<u>SIGNATURE</u>
1.	
2.	
3.	
<u>AUTHORIZING SIGNATURE(S)</u>	
PROJECT DIRECTOR 1.	
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER 2.	

SPONSORED PROGRAMS OFFICER 3.	

Proposal: Cover Page

SUMMARY PROPOSAL BUDGET FOR TGP

NAME OF INSTITUTION					
PROJECT DIRECTOR					
A. SENIOR PERSONNEL: PD, Co-PDs, Faculty and Other Senior Personnel	Number of Person-months			Funds Requested	Funds Awarded
	CAL	ACAD	SUMB		
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6. () OTHERS (LIST INDIVIDUALLY ON BUDGET EXPLANATION PAGE)					
7. () TOTAL SENIOR PERSONNEL (1-6)					
B. OTHER PERSONNEL (SHOW NUMBERS IN BRACKETS)					
1. () POSTDOCTORAL ASSOCIATES					
2. () OTHER PROFESSIONALS (TECHNICIAN, PROGRAMMER, ETC.)					
3. () GRADUATE STUDENTS					
4. () UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS					
5. () SECRETARIAL - CLERICAL (IF CHARGED DIRECTLY)					
6. () OTHER					
TOTAL SALARIES AND WAGES (A + B)					
C. FRINGE BENEFITS (IF CHARGED AS DIRECT COSTS)					
TOTAL SALARIES, WAGES AND FRINGE BENEFITS (A + B + C)					
D. EQUIPMENT (LIST ITEM AND DOLLAR AMOUNT FOR EACH ITEM EXCEEDING \$5,000; FOR ALL SYSTEMS AT \$5000 OR ABOVE, LIST COMPONENT PARTS)					
E. TRAVEL: DOMESTIC only (INCL. CANADA, MEXICO AND U.S. POSSESSIONS)					
F. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT					
1. TRAVEL					
2. SUBSISTENCE					
3. OTHER					
TOTAL \$ _____					
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS ()					
TOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS					
G. OTHER DIRECT COSTS					

1. MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES		
2. PROJECT DESIGN AND EVALUATION		
3. CONSULTANT SERVICES		
4. COMPUTER SERVICES		
5. SUBCONTRACTS		
6. OTHER		
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS		
H. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (A THROUGH G)	\$	\$
I. CONTRIBUTED INDIRECT COSTS. (RATE X BASE) N.B.: Indirect costs are not allowable under TGP, but may be reported here.		
J. TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT COSTS (H + I)	\$	\$

LETTER OF INTENT FORMS:

LETTER OF INTENT - COVER SHEET for TGP

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

CHE PROPOSAL NUMBER: (To be assigned by CHE)	AMOUNT REQUESTED: (Round to nearest hundred dollars)
--	--

SPECIFIC PROJECT FOCUS:

PROJECT START DATE:	PROJECT END DATE:
----------------------------	--------------------------

NAME OF INSTITUTION or CONSORTIUM:	DEPARTMENT:
---	--------------------

TITLE OF PROPOSED PROJECT:

PROJECT DIRECTOR: NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE
----------------------------------	-------	-----------

ADDRESS:

E-MAIL ADDRESS:	PHONE:
------------------------	---------------

CO-PROJECT DIRECTOR(S) NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE
---------------------------------------	-------	-----------

Signature of Authorizing Individual	Title
-------------------------------------	-------

The signature of the authorizing individual is required. This signature indicates that the proposed project has been approved internally by the Chief Academic Officer, and the Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs as one consistent with the mission and objectives of the institution and congruent with the goal of implementation of and greater use of technology for teaching and learning.

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

Letter of Intent-Project Summary

LETTER OF INTENT - LIST OF SUGGESTED REVIEWERS

List the names and addresses of five potential reviewers to be filed with the Letter of Intent. **Do not contact them or they will be disqualified.** These referrals must be persons with either a regional or national reputation for their knowledge and experience in the appropriate area of technology. Only one person nominated per institution will be eligible to serve as a reviewer. Potential reviewers may reside or work within or outside the State of South Carolina and may be public or private sector employees. However, **any conflict-of-interest must be avoided. This would include close family relationships, co-publishers in the last five years, dissertation advisors, a business or financial partner, and potential vendors. Institutional representatives may in some cases wish to discuss the appropriateness of inclusion with the staff of the Commission on Higher Education’s Division of Academic Affairs and Licensing prior to submission of the Letter of Intent.** Please include complete address, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses if available. If there are any individuals that the institution or consortium prefers not to have as a reviewer of this proposal, please list them at the end of this form on the lines provided.

1) Name: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

 Phone #: _____
 E-Mail: _____

4) Name: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

 Phone #: _____
 E-Mail: _____

2) Name: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

 Phone #: _____
 E-Mail: _____

5) Name: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

 Phone #: _____
 E-Mail: _____

3) 3) Name: _____
 Institution: _____
 Address: _____

LETTER OF INTENT -LIST OF SUGGESTED REVIEWERS (pg. 2)

Reviewers for this proposal should have expertise in the area(s) of :

Individuals you prefer NOT review this proposal (please list name and institution):

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

