

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Edith Gummer: Thank you. I would like to remind the participants that if you have a video camera that you have it turned off during the Webinar and that we will take questions at the end of the Webinar and they will be assisted questions so the operator will come back and ask for them and you can sign-up for them then.

Good afternoon and welcome to the EHR Webinar on the EHR core research program which we also call the ECR. I am a Program Officer in the Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Environments.

And I have a number of other program officers who are here with me from the Division of Graduate Education, Division of Human Resource Development, and the Division of Undergraduate Education.

Let me get this started. This is the URL [http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=504924] for the Website for the EHR core research program. At this Website you can find all of the information that will be posted about the program including the solicitation which you can download and the archived Webinar from this afternoon or from yesterday.

Please note that the Website and the solicitation indicate two target dates of July 12th, 2013 and February 4th, 2014. This is a little bit different than our typical solicitations in that there is a target date rather than due date.

That means that in order to be considered for Fiscal Year 2013 funding, all the proposals have to be in by July 12th but proposals can come in at any point up until July 12th and be considered for funding after July 12th, they can come in at any point in order to be considered by February 4th. We will be processing the proposals in a more iterative fashion in Fiscal year 2014.

Also please note that on the Website you can sign-up to be a reviewer for this program for this summer review of the proposals that come in. We are in need of reviewers.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

If you decide to sit out this competition and wait and see what gets funded in order to position yourself for next year or if you know someone who's interested in performing as a reviewer, please go to the Website [http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=504924].

There is a survey that you can sign-up on Survey Monkey [<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6T3HXTD>] that will put you onto the list for the reviewer pool and we very definitely welcome your participation as a reviewer if you do not submit a proposal.

The EHR core research establishes a mechanism in EHR to provide funding in foundational research areas that are broad, essential and enduring. We are looking at foundational or fundamental research that intends to synthesize, to build and/or to expand on research in all of the disciplinary communities that are supported by NSF and that's all of the disciplinary areas that are the research and research-associated activity areas.

The core areas for the research in EHR are around STEM learning, STEM learning environments, STEM workforce development and broadening participation in STEM and we will discuss those - the core areas - in more detail later on in this presentation.

We anticipate funding up to 28 awards based on the mixture of high-quality proposal types that we receive in Fiscal Year 2013 so by this fall we anticipate funding up to 28 awards pending funding availability. This is obviously going to create a very short timeline for submission and review of the proposals.

This slide shows the different types of research proposals that we are anticipating for this program including the core research proposals that have a maximum budget request of \$1.5 million and a maximum duration request of five years. Obviously you can request a proposal that is for fewer years and less funding but those are the maximums.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

We're also doing something that's a little bit different. We're focusing on capacity-building proposals and these are capacity-building to do research. These capacity-building proposals are for a maximum of \$300,000 and a maximum duration of three years.

The intent of these proposal types is to identify and conduct research on questions or issues to advance the improvement of STEM education or STEM learning in general. We're very much interested in the identification of grand challenges or challenges of great importance around which the research in this program will be funded.

This is what we mean by core research, the beginning of our operational definition if you will of what we mean by this. These proposals will study a foundational research question or issues that's designed to inform the transformation of STEM learning and education.

Based on research that tells us what we know now, what do we need to know in order to improve STEM learning and education in the future and that's not just STEM learning in the formal sense. It's also STEM learning in the ongoing learning in the workforce and in the informal environment.

This research is intended to have PIs think clearly about how they contribute to synthesizing, expanding or building the research base, the knowledge and evidence that's needed to achieve excellence in STEM education and in workforce development.

The path of the [capacity] building proposals again focus on research, they're intended to help the field identify and clarify these grand challenges and the nature of the research teams and methodologies that are intended to address them so they're supporting the groundwork that's necessary to advance research in the four core areas.

Some examples of capacity-building proposals that will be appropriate for ECR include workshops, sandpits, ideas labs or charrettes, exploratory or consensus study

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

and a number of field-initiated activities. Again, the focus is on building the capacity to conduct research.

We sometimes talk about “ch-ops” or challenges and opportunities in education and when a new initiative announcement is announced, these are frequently brought to the forefront. The ECR is intended to address the substantive opportunities and challenges that we face in improving and optimizing STEM education and development.

These opportunities that we encounter include a rich diversity of human capital in STEM. We need to make sure that everyone gets to be involved in some of aspects of STEM. Rapid scientific advances in STEM fields are also an opportunity upon which the research that’s needed in STEM education can be grounded.

And finally a national and continued emphasis on innovation in STEM both in the research areas and in development and in education is another opportunity that we can build on.

These opportunities provide us with a number of challenges, preparing the diverse workforce with adequate competencies and knowledge to advance STEM is a continuing challenge that we’ve experienced. It’s also very important that we continue and expand upon informing citizenry about how STEM can affect their daily lives.

And finally it’s important for us to accept the challenge to improve and inform STEM educational practices. We no longer have the students in our schools and in our colleges and in our workforce development that we had 20 years ago. We need education systems that match them.

So why start a new research program, a core research program in EHR? It’s not that EHR has not been funding foundational or fundamental research in STEM education. In fact, EHR has a long history across a number of different programs in funding this type of research.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

The purposes for having a core research program now is to make strategic investments in the best ideas in STEM education to bring coherence and coordination to the research endeavors in which NSF is involved.

And to help us have confidence about the potential impact of these investments to look beyond just research into how that research can improve education so it's essential to have a coherent and deep scientific research base that guides and informs efforts to meet this national STEM education workforce development challenge, those needs and priorities.

How is ECR different then that what NSF has funded in the past? Current approaches to building the research base in education are often embedded in program announcements that focus on specific objectives or prescribed activities across EHR. Many of our programs have research aspects to them but they are mainly development programs.

No current EHR program addresses all four of the core research areas, for instance the REESE program which is now known as (REAL) focuses on three of the core areas but does not focus on workforce development so the ECR provides us with a mechanism for accumulating foundational knowledge in the four core areas to help ensure that we are making the best investments that we can make.

All of the projects funded through this program must make clear contributions to synthesizing, expanding or building the base of research, research knowledge and the evidence needed for these core areas.

So I want to comment particularly on the last bullet in this slide, theory-driven, theory generating, theory testing and predictive studies - so we're looking for evidence-based studies and again the proposals definitely can include collaboration.

In fact we encourage collaboration among researchers in related disciplines [to education research] including the social and behavioral sciences. The proposals could

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

include and address issues confronting learners from pre-K all the way to the workforce. Settings could range from formal to informal, from virtual to outdoor field environments and include institutional research and development.

The four core areas again are these: STEM learning, STEM learning environments, STEM workforce and development and broadening participation in STEM. Now I want to emphasize the fact that you have seen a reference to foundational research throughout the program announcement.

Foundational research is really designed to enable us to gain a much deeper understanding of the issues that are embedded in these four core areas and to enable us to focus on the needs, the knowledge gaps and new opportunities within these four areas as well as among them.

STEM learning, learning of specific STEM disciplinary knowledge and practices across different groups of learners, context and environment. Learning includes cognitive, social and behavioral competencies, range of theoretical and methodological approaches including the use of big data, focus on learning at the frontiers of STEM disciplines and interdisciplinarity.

Now this encompasses the idea of K through 12, learning progression, assessments as well as cyber-enabled learning. Research is sought to focus on STEM learning and engagement in all settings and a dissemination of knowledge through social networks.

Proposals definitely could address issues such as integrating research knowledge from different theoretical and/or methodological perspectives. The role of constructs such as persistence and identity is also an important topic. We're also interested in research that focuses on particular groups of learners in various settings.

STEM learning environments. Research is needed to address these constant changes in learning environments and the shifting roles of producer and consumers of knowledge. STEM learning environments might range from a department or program

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

to a model curriculum, museum, exhibit or summer internship program (or teacher) preparation program.

It is important for us to understand the characteristics of learning environments and how they interact with the various pathways a learner might choose and how these environments support or hinder multiple aspects of STEM learning.

Of special interest are proposals that examine changing and emerging environments such as online media learning at scale, blended instruction, virtual reality, personalized learning environments and evidence-based approaches to undergraduate and graduate teaching.

Proposals may adopt a variety of theoretical perspectives and employ a range of methodologies and on this slide you can see that we are seeking proposals that will address a whole range of formal and informal learning environments across the entire K through 16 landscape.

Develop an understanding of how characteristics of learning environments interact with the support, multiple aspects of STEM learning, focus on emerging learning environments and evidence-based approaches to undergraduates STEM instruction.

STEM workforce development. EHR already invest very heavily in efforts to prepare a diverse highly-skilled workforce including STEM teachers that can lead and innovate in a complex global economy so we're seeking proposals to strengthen the research base that informs our investments in STEM workforce preparation and development at all levels.

We're seeking proposals that will give us an evidence-based understanding of STEM learning because this is necessary with respect to career pathways and transitions both academic as well as non-academic careers, knowledge about emerging practices and changing context of the STEM workforce, changing higher education climate and the capacity for reforming STEM workforce development efforts.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

We're seeking proposals to build a better understanding of how different funding models at the undergraduate and graduate levels for example research assistantships and fellowships and traineeships might best equip the 21st Century workforce with those advanced and flexible skills that are needed to enable them to be workforce-ready.

Research is needed also for the backwards mapping from workforce expectations for knowledge and competencies to the design of interventions and delivery systems so we encourage ideas that leverage NSF's investments, the current investments that we're making in programs such as research centers and large facilities' programs as well as workforce development projects.

So the STEM workforce development program should focus on - and these are research proposals - that will focus on the preparation of a diverse globally-prepared and highly-skilled STEM workforce including teachers, focus on the entire STEM workforce continuum from pre-K to post-doctoral training to the career, emphasis on both academic and non-academic STEM career pathways and transitions across these changing contexts and climates and connecting workplace expectations to design of interventions.

Broadening participation in STEM. We all know that leadership in the global STEM enterprise does require inclusion of all sectors of the population. We also know that the literature does indicate continuing underrepresentation of women, Hispanics, African-Americans, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders and persons with disabilities in STEM education and research and in the STEM workforce.

So we're seeking proposals that examine fundamental research questions about what it takes to broaden participation effectively including a better understanding of how to build institutional capacity and informal learning environments that foster the untapped potential of underrepresented [groups] in STEM.

Research is needed that [is] focused on retention and persistence and how public/private partnerships can address these issues and facilitate successful

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

transitions to graduate school or to the workforce. Research that examines [the impact] of diversity, or lack thereof, [on] innovation and productivity in STEM education and the workforce [could also be appropriate]. Proposals focused on the broadening participation core, should focus on practices that broaden participation, retention and success of individuals underrepresented in STEM.

Preparing students for successful transition to further education or training or the STEM workforce, study of accessibility and the impacts of technology on diverse populations, measures, processes and metrics to assess these impacts and outcomes of broadening participation and institutional capacity building initiatives.

[For] some of you who are veterans who are putting in proposals to NSF, this is going to seem quite familiar but there are some interesting quirks in it.

Again we will be making standard or continuing grants. We estimate making 28 depending upon the funding. We're on Slide Number 17 for those of you who are watching and/or who are looking at the slides separately.

The funding amount for this fiscal year is \$20 million, again pending availability of funds. There is no [principal investigator] limits and there is no limit on the number of proposals per organization. There is no limit on the number of proposals per principal investigator. It's very open competition.

These are the sections of the proposal that you will need to fill out. They include a cover sheet on which you put the information about your institution and be sure on that cover sheet to check the IRB that you are required to fill-in.

You will also for those of you who have not applied to NSF in awhile, the project summary in FastLane is slightly different. You have to put in text about the intellectual merit and the broader impacts of your proposals so it's the required boxes that need to be filled-in.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

We also ask that you put in a brief summary of what you're doing and state which of the four core areas are targeted to help us in our initial sorting of the proposal. Fast lane will generate a table of content for you. Most of your work will go into the project description.

Again we're asking you to restate at the top of your project description which of the four core areas - area or areas - are targeted. In the project description, you put in the details of what you are going to do and to whom and how so the research questions that you address are very important.

The methodology that you will use to answer those research questions, the population with whom you will be studying the context, all of these are important considerations.

We recommend that you look at the NSF grant proposal guide which is at the URL below and I'm reminding you that the Webinar will be archived so that you can find these URLs easily.

Other sections of the proposals include the references cited. You must include an NSF-formatted biographical sketch or sketches of all of the key personnel. You need to include a budget on an NSF template and a budget justification and again the grant proposal guide can give you information about exactly how these need to be addressed.

You need to describe the current and pending support that you currently have for which you have applied. You need to describe the facilities, equipment and other resources that you will use to carry out the research and then two supplemental documents are allowed under this competition.

One of them is the post-doctoral research or mentoring plan and the other is the data management plan. The post-doc plan tells how you will mentor any post-doc that is part of your project and again if you don't have one then it's not applicable.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

The data management plan needs to address the nature, the security, the storage and the accessibility of the data that you will collect. I'd like to emphasize that issues of sharing the data also need to be included as well as how you will handle archiving the data.

We're really asking you to focus on the research design and the methodology in these proposals that are appropriate to the research questions that you are asking. We ask that you address well-documented, usable and replicable models, frameworks, data, literature and measure.

So again all of these need to be clearly described so that we know not just what you're doing but how you're going to do it. Our best proposals spend a tremendous amount of energy describing this very well.

You need well-justified methods that are consonant with the theory that you're on which you're basing your research and that are suited to the questions or the hypotheses that you are generating.

The NSF merit review principles have been updated by the National Science Board. They indicate that NSF projects should be of the highest quality. They really need to have the potential to advance if not transform the frontiers of knowledge and this is certainly the case in education.

NSF projects in the aggregate should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals. This is sometimes seen as being sort of an obvious and easy thing in education, but again you'll need in your broader impacts to describe how you think that you will achieve this.

Meaningful assessment and evaluations of NSF-funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects. We're not going to ask you to do more than we could provide you with the resources to do.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

These are the NSF merit review criteria. Intellectual merit really addresses the potential to advance knowledge. Broader impacts addresses the potential to benefit society and to contribute to the achievement of specific desired societal outcomes.

Both of these criteria - both intellectual merit and broader impact - are given full consideration during the review and decision-making processes. You must address both of these criteria and the way that the merit review criteria are written, the characteristics address both of these categories.

So as you're thinking about the intellectual merit, you need to consider what's the potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields and how does it benefit society or advance those desired societal outcomes?

To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original or potentially transformative concepts? Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activity well-reasoned, well-organized and based on a sound rationale?

Again, the research design and the way that you describe how you're going to do the research that you've put forward in this proposal is extremely important. Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?

This suggests that an evaluation in some form or another is an important part of this proposal. The program announcement does not explicitly call for an evaluation but again your plan has to have some mechanism to assess success.

Other merit review considerations include the qualification of the individual team or organization to conduct the proposed activity. Because this is research in education in STEM, it's important to have adequate representative, adequate expertise on the proposal for both the STEM disciplinary areas and educational research.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Are there adequate resources available to the investigators either at their home institution or through collaboration to carry out the work that's put forward in the proposal?

Our reviewers are also asked to review the facilities, equipment and other resources, the data management plan and the post-doctoral research mentoring plan so these aspects of the proposal also contribute to the merit of the proposal.

This is an important deviation from our usual focus on human subjects or institutional review board approvals. In the past we have been able to especially for proposals that come in late we've been able to get a temporary deferment of IRB approval when awards were made.

They will no longer allow us to do that so IRB exemption or approval documentation is required at the time of the award in order to receive federal Year 2013 funding.

If you cannot get IRB approval, then we will consider you for 2014 funding. Given the extremely short notice, we will not be able to wait for that IRB documentation so please plan for the timing necessary to obtain IRB approval recognizing that many IRB boards are not active at universities during the summer.

The best way to ensure that you have the time necessary is to include the IRB exemption or approval document with the submission of the proposal and you can include those on the front page of the proposal we will also allow those as supplementary documents at the end of the proposal.

So we are almost ready to take questions. Again you can address the question to the program at this e-mail address [ECR@nsf.gov]. It will come in to the central address and then one of the program officers associated with the program will address that question.

The program management or oversight; the cognizant program officers are listed here [http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=504924]. Many of them are in

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

the room waiting to hear the questions that you might have. You can address your questions to anyone.

They are a representative of the different divisions of EHR so they include all of the areas that for which this announcement is appropriate. Again, the Website address, the full proposal target dates of July 12th, 2013, that's the big one to remember and to think about and I believe we are ready for questions.

(Mark Leddy): And this is (Mark Leddy) speaking and we already have four questions that have come in on chat and so we'd like to address those first. The first question is please address what we mean by big data when we're talking about big data (unintelligible).

Edith Gummer: Big data can include any large amounts of data that are either sufficiently large in terms of the database size or sufficiently complex that they can't be handled by typical research or statistical analyses so big data might include data coming from MOOCs or massive open online courses.

They may include data coming from educationally-serious gaming or online learning environments. They may include administrative data in education that address sort of the womb-to-tomb data around education of citizens.

(Mark Leddy): Would you also please address the evaluation to be conducted by an external evaluator?

Edith Gummer: This is a question that we get across our program. Because the merit review criteria talks about having a mechanism to assess the success of the proposed activity, that does indicate the need for some form of evaluation.

The program announcement is silent about the structure of the evaluation. We are tending to be fairly agnostic about the type of evaluation or the processes that you use for evaluation.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Certainly there has to be some objective process by which [to measure] the extent to which you are carrying out the activities that you [said you would carry] out in this research area - so that may be accomplished by having an advisory board that provides evaluation. It may be accomplished by hiring an external evaluator.

(Mark Leddy): This is (Mark) again. [Someone] asked about the 28 awards; the idea right now is that 28 awards - depending upon the quality of those proposals and the availability of funds - would [be made] from the July 12th target date. Remember we will gladly accept proposals prior to that date.

Edith Gummer: I would also add that the [mix] 28 awards depend upon the mix between the capacity-building awards and the larger research awards and so the 28 is the maximum that we came up with looking across that distribution.

(Mark Leddy): And the questions are flying in on the chat line: [Do they need to include] prior NSF support [only] on this topic, a related topic or any topic?

Edith Gummer: I think what you want to do is convince the reviewers that if you have had prior NSF support and it is relevant to this research, that you have done a good job on that and that you have disseminated the findings from that research adequately. Why don't we start to line people up on the phone?

Coordinator: If you would like to ask a question, please press star 1. To withdraw your request, please press star 2. Once again if you'd like to ask a question, please press star 1 and please standby for any questions. Yes, our first question is from (Suri). Your line is open.

(Suri): Thank you. My question is around eligibility for small businesses on this proposal so if we are a small business and we have hired faculty on our team on the proposing team, do we qualify for this track of funding?

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Edith Gummer: Certainly small businesses can apply. Small businesses have to demonstrate that they are eligible to receive a funding from a federal agency and particularly funding from the National Science Foundation.

For the Fiscal Year 2013 competition, the issue's going to be whether or not you are a new performer and have not had NSF funding in the past, the timing is very tight to get that approval put forward.

(Suri): Could you elaborate a little bit more on the approval process please, so that we could probably shoot for the 2014 timeline then?

Edith Gummer: I would recommend that you go to FastLane on www.nsf.gov. There is an FAQ that has a great deal of information about the process that has to be put in place and the processes that need to be active in an organization in order to receive that funding.

(Crystal): Hi. I'm interesting in finding out if you're open to qualitative research methods.

Edith Gummer: I would say that clearly yes we are, that the research methodology needs to be appropriate to the research questions and/or hypotheses that are being put forward so we will not discard research proposals because they focus on qualitative research designs. Indeed, many of the explanations about why things are the way they are happen through qualitative inquiry.

(Claudia): Yes, hi. Thank you. Can we submit a proposal for ECR that is currently pending in one of the programs that is going away, namely CE21 or the July 12 target date?

Edith Gummer: If it has already been submitted to NSF and if it is entered into the review process, then no, you cannot submit the same proposal into ECR.

(Claudia): Regardless if that program is going away?

Edith Gummer: Yes.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Barry Sloane: When you said the program is going away, is the proposal being reviewed?

(Claudia): Well, I submitted it in March for the date of that CE21 but in the information that came in terms of the programs that were not going to continue, that particular program CE21 is in that list.

Barry Sloane: Then I would suggest that you withdraw the proposal from that competition if it doesn't exist and then check to see that it's appropriate in terms of its questions, methodologies and the like relative to this call.

(Claudia): Okay, thank you. Who am I speaking with, sorry?

Barry Sloane: My name is Barry Sloane, S-L-O-A-N-E.

Edith Gummer: Yes, I would check with the CE21 program officers to find out if you submitted in response to a solicitation and they aren't going to fund in Fiscal Year 2013 and your proposal is in the mix for funding for 2013, then you don't want to withdraw it but you cannot resubmit it for the ECR while it is being considered in another program.

I would also like to add that the CE21 program [has] not totally disappearing from NSF. It is [proposed to be] merged with the math science partnership to be part of a new program called STEM-C [in the FY 2014 budget request].

(Kathleen): Yes, thank you. My question is the REESE competition still going to be competed or is REESE being replaced by REAL and if so, what will be the difference between the REESE and the REAL competitions?

Barry Sloane: In answer to your first question, the REESE solicitation no longer exists. It [is expected to] be reformulated as REAL. The focus areas within REAL overlap significantly with core business, [however] the REAL program will not entertain proposals around workforce issues.

Edith Gummer: So we anticipate a REAL solicitation will come out in the early summer.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Deva Duda): Yes, hi, so the question is about the capacity-building proposals or that track. Is capacity-building the same as like a planning grant or is it more of a research proposal with a limited scope and size?

Barry Sloane: We believe that it's more likely the latter which may result in synthetic work that supports the capacity-building of the nation to undertake research in a particular space as opposed to local capacity-building.

Edith Gummer: So for example one of the formats that was put forward is this idea of a sandpit or an Ideas Laboratory. An Ideas Lab in NSF is the convening of a diverse group of people, diverse groups of researchers from a number of different perspectives, whose intention is [focused to] identify and clarify research questions around a particular topic or grand challenge.

So a proposal that is intended to do that would be an appropriate proposal for the capacity-building track.

(Deva Duda): I see. Okay, thank you.

(Mark Leddy): This is (Mark). If I could really quickly I could probably take care of five chat questions in about a minute. Proposals are welcome from all types of institutions and organizations that are eligible for NSF funding. That includes predominantly undergraduate institutions as well as all other types.

Collaborative proposals of more than one institution together are welcome and an institution can indeed submit more than one proposal, therefore they can receive funding for multiple awards. That is a possibility that when you do part of a collaborative, those would be separate proposals submitted.

The expected funding date is not stated in the program announcement but it is typically a six-month processing time for us at NSF; however, we are planning to try

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

to make our awards in this fiscal year which is Fiscal Year '13 which ends by [September 31st].

(Renee): I just wanted to follow-up a little bit with the connection between REAL and the core program especially in the STEM... Just wanting to clarify some with the connections between REAL and core particularly the STEM learning track so the sense I got is that there's really not any, it's just two opportunities.

Barry Sloane: That would be one way to view us. I would say that the tradition within REESE is a little more prescribed as it rolls over into REAL so there's a sense to what the program wants and so I would suggest that you read the new solicitation carefully.

What's pretty clear about this shift to Core as an additional funding stream is that it is directorate-wide and so there is no constraint on the age of the students participating in the study. There's no constraint on the STEM content to be engaged in and so there are subtle differences that on first blush might not be overtly apparent.

(Lee Fang): Yes, I have a quick question on the allocation of funds. Are there specific guidelines in terms of the four different areas of funding STEM learning versus STEM workforce development?

Edith Gummer: There is some additional description of what those might look like but it's in the solicitation - but again the call is quite a broad call across those areas and again you don't have to address all of those areas nor do you have to address the K-16 or K out into the workforce. You can target your research at a particular age range or a particular population.

(Lee Fang): All right, thanks. I'm also wondering if specific studies let's say look at institutional effectiveness, say Hispanic-Serving Institutions. Would that be of interest to NSF because that's more of a U.S. Department of Education arena or area but since it's related to STEM workforce development, I wonder if that will fit with a call for proposal?

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Edith Gummer: I think to the extent that the focus is on STEM learning and that it is focused on research on the STEM learning environment [and broadening participation], research in that arena would be appropriate for this call. Certainly those institutions would be highly eligible to submit those proposals.

(Lee Fang): All right, thank you. I have a last question - how is this ECR call related to the CAREER award?

Edith Gummer: This is independent of the career award.

(Lee Fang): Okay, thank you.

Edith Gummer: Okay, may I just also add that if [a Hispanic-serving institution] wants to do some research about some proven intervention to improve the success rate of persons going into the STEM workforce that that is also acceptable.

(Lee Fang): Great, thank you.

(Leilani): Hi, thank you. I was wondering for those PIs who are young faculty members and with little or no preliminary data to include in a proposal, what kind of advice do you have? For example, do you think we should wait until we have data to include in a proposal or should we go ahead and present our idea and submit it and any other type of advice you might have?

Barry Sloane: I don't think that it hurts you to propose. I would look carefully at other programs so if you look at the CAREER program within the NSF or at large specifically how it pertains to EHR if your work is in education, it would mean that within that space you would be competing with other early career potential awardees and not competing against the great mass of people who submit proposals.

That said, without a submission we have no way to provide you feedback so you could have a very fine proposal and the feedback would be that we would want to present you with an award. Your proposal might not reach the cutoff for an award but

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

if you don't submit it, there's no opportunity for you to receive feedback from the program.

Edith Gummer: I would also recommend that a new career researcher in STEM education check the NSF Website to look at the nature of the research questions and/or hypotheses and/or research agendas that have been successful in previous programs at NSF especially focusing on things that have been funded under the REESE program.

(Leilani): Thank you.

(Dwayne): Yes, hello. I think my question was answered as one of the presenters said early it was more about geography of the awards that are presented. Just for my own clarification though, the emphasis is on organizational collaborative effort; is that correct?

Barry Sloane: No. The emphasis is on basic research in the four dimensions spoken of, learning, learning environments, broadening participation and workforce development. We're looking for high-quality research proposals in each of those areas. Should you choose to collaborate with another group to generate that quality of proposal, that's up to you.

(Dwayne): So the - I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off - the possibility then exists that awards could be given - multiple awards could be given - to a same city, two programs with different focuses.

Barry Sloane: Absolutely. The key would be the quality of the proposal.

(Claudia): Can the broadening participation track can these include pilot interventions as part of the research study?

Edith Gummer: Again, I think the distinction for us would be the difference between development and research so if the broadening participation is the context of an intervention and you're conducting research on that intervention...

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Claudia): Absolutely, yes, that would be the idea.

Edith Gummer: ...yes, then as long as the focus is on research then that would be appropriate for this announcement.

(Claudia): Thank you.

(Mary): Thank you. Yes, this I think relates perhaps to the previous question but just for a little bit more clarification, I'm wondering whether the program would support the development of say curriculum activities or materials that would be designed to help answer a research question related to say student learning? Does it support that level of development?

Barry Sloane: It's unlikely that it will. There are other programs within NSF that support that development particularly in the K-12 arena due to the DRK12 program specifically so if you present a proposal over a three-year period where 2-1/2 years are dedicated to the development of a piece of curriculum where there might be some tests of that curriculum in the final six months but this is not the right spot for that type of submission.

(Mary): Okay, thanks.

(John): Yes. I would like you to clarify what you meant by the grand challenges in particular are you interested in us linking to for example the grand challenge in DEB, the Division of Environmental Biology with climate science or specifically other STEM education grand challenges that we would need to address?

Edith Gummer: I think for this competition, we would like you to focus on the grand challenges with STEM education.

(John): Okay, thank you.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

- Barry Sloane: That said, I think if the teaching and learning of climate science is important, then this is a good spot to submit that kind of work.
- (John): What we're particularly interested in is getting students involved with original research and evaluating them into seeing what works and so they would be doing climate research and then evaluating that.
- Edith Gummer: I think again you need to focus on what are the important educational research questions or hypotheses about student learnings or about student learning environments that you are addressing.
- (John): Okay, thank you very much.
- (Kim): Hi. I know with REESE previously if there was not a psychologist or someone very heavy in psychology as a co-PI, there was a lack of funding for that proposal so I was wondering with it being so closely tied to REESE the REAL and the Core proposals, if that emphasis was still needed.
- Barry Sloane: Again, I believe that fundamentally the research questions that you generate that need to be addressed in the proposal, how those are theorized and located in the research literature and what methodologies you bring to bear relative to those questions are what will be reviewed.
- Edith Gummer: But I would also add that clearly if you're addressing research questions around learning and learning environments and there is not someone who has significant expertise in the learning sciences on the proposal and the methodology, you know, does not - if the methodology is not supported by the expertise of the team that's doing the research - that is one of the things that contributes to an unsuccessful proposal.
- Barry Sloane: And I would add that's similar for broadening participation research or for research on workforce development.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

- (Kim): Okay, I just with the incoming flood of DBR people and scientists, I was just wondering if that was still needed with the people trained in both science and education research methods and topologies.
- Barry Sloane: Yes, absolutely, you need a team of people who can who together can address the questions proposed in the proposal.
- (Kim): Okay. Thank you.
- Barry Sloane: But one of the criteria is the quality of the folks submitting to get the work done.
- (Bianca): Hi, this reminds me a little bit of NPR. I love your show and thank you for taking my call. My question is the overlap of the maybe overlap of the Core and REAL solicitations, whether the same or similar proposal could be submitted for both?
- Barry Sloane: There's a simple answer to that (Bianca). No.
- (Bianca): No?
- Barry Sloane: No. A similar proposal cannot be reviewed by two programs within that six-month period.
- (Bianca): Within the six-month period.
- Barry Sloane: Yes, so if there's an overlap, then it makes it inappropriate to submit to two programs.
- (Bianca): Right, but a July if it's - well - early summer, it's going to come out and when do you think your REAL closing date will be?
- Barry Sloane: We honestly don't know at this point in time but it will be within 90 days of the public announcement of the program.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Bianca): Right. Okay, thanks. Have a good one.

(Kathleen): Hi, I just wanted to clarify a question related to the workforce development proposals so my understanding is that workforce development will be a component of the core competition but not the REAL competition; is that correct? I'm thinking of a proposal about future professional development.

Barry Sloane: That is correct.

Edith Gummer: Okay, we have a number of other questions that have come from the chat. Let me answer one of them. The question was, Isn't REAL about research on evaluations so improving the tools and strategies of evaluation? [And the answer is] That is actually not the REAL program. That is the PRIME program, the promoting research and innovation in methodology for evaluations and that program will have a solicitation coming out sometime late fall/early winter.

(Mark Leddy): And I would like to add to that, that we've been talking about REAL primarily as it related to what REESE [was] but [REAL] also incorporates two additional programs which are the Research and Disabilities Education program and the Research on Gender in Science and Engineering program so REAL is actually REESE, RDE, and GSE combined.

Barry Sloane: Thank you, (Mark).

Edith Gummer: There was a question about: Can software or curricular development be supported as part of a core proposal if a significant or majority of the funding is for the research and if there's an allocation difference?

Again the issue is that the Core is not funding curriculum development. Core is however funding research for which tools might be developed in order to conduct that research so long as the development is done in the service of the research and not having the research tagged onto the development, that would be appropriate.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

The question is - would you not do the research without the tools and is the development such a large proportion of the project, that you're better off going for a development grant under a different program such as DRK12 or under the new [proposed CUASE] program [in the FY 2014 budget request] and then conducting your research on it.

Okay, again we are looking at a range of potential number of proposals to be funded. If you look at the funding levels, we can have a maximum of 28 awards. We don't know how many we're going to have and this program announcement is an open program announcement.

It will occur over each of the next fiscal years, probably gradually changing somewhat in terms of the [amount] of the funds that are available - so while this fiscal year is going to kick them off, this will be an annual competition.

Again it will happen as a rather more open process over the course of the year rather than being focused on a single funding date so it's ongoing and we don't know for sure how many proposals we will fund.

If you cannot get IRB approval within the July submissions, then we cannot fund you in the Fiscal Year 2013 budget. We can however if it is a highly-competitive proposal that is one that we are intending or considering funding, we can hold that over until 2014 to give you a longer period of time to get your IRB submission.

So we put the caveat, the warning about needing the IRB approval in to ensure that those proposals that want to get funding within this fiscal year can do so. We recognize that without this announcement within a very tight timeline both for the development of the proposal and in terms of getting the IRB approval.

So I would recommend that you submit and if you can't get IRB approval, we can if it's a fundable proposal we can carry it over. There's a question about: Is it necessary that proposals address implications for policy or practice?

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Clearly it is intended to address research around important issues and important research agendas in education. If the part of the research agenda that you're addressing deals with practice, then that needs to be the focus of the research that you do.

If the clear question is policy, that's a little more murky for NSF. I would recommend that you contact a program officer and have a longer conversation with them about that so let me just add that if you are suggesting some research that it has implications for policy to help guide EHR investments in these core areas, that's a different question.

So that's the foundational research that we're asking you to propose to us and that's to help us gain a much deeper understanding of all the issues again that are embedded in these core areas so that's what we're asking you to provide for us primarily.

[Another question] When will the CAUSE solicitation be?

Barry Sloane: Unfortunately we're not at liberty at this juncture to be able to say anything further about the CAUSE solicitation other than we hope to be able to get it out in a timely manner [once the FY 2014 budget request is approved by Congress].

As far as the panels for the process, unfortunately we're not going to be able to provide you with any greater detail as to whether or not we're going to do them in remotely or [on-site] but we'll be looking at reviewers to be able to help us.

So those of you who do not feel as if you're ready to be able to submit a proposal at this juncture but would like to be able to participate in the review process, please visit a program Website and submit your name on our reviewer sheet and sign-up [<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/6T3HXTD>].

Edith Gummer: We certainly will be doing some of the panels remotely or as blended panels so if the issue is coming to NSF, we can bring the review panel to you virtually.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

I think if you have questions about the appropriateness of a particular research idea for this program announcement, it would probably be best for you to put that into an e-mail and address it to one of the program officers or to address it to the ECR e-mail address. I would also say that this is an ongoing competition, that there are target dates, there are not due dates.

So if you don't make the July 12th, 2013 target date, you could submit your proposal on July 13 and it will be considered in the next batch of proposals that are coming in. We will be making award decisions throughout the year as these proposals come in over the next fiscal year.

Barry Sloane: Yes, if you review in the summer, yes you are allowed to be able to submit [later]. Again, this is a target date and as was mentioned...

(Mark Leddy): Sorry, if you review in the summer you are not allowed to submit in the summer but you would be allowed to submit in the following competition.

Edith Gummer: Right.

Barry Sloane: So since it is a target date, you can submit year-around but you will not be part of whatever review is going on at that juncture so you cannot be reviewing at the time that your proposal is in that review process and we will let you know.

As far as which program officer to contact, we would prefer that you do not send them to a specific program officer. We'd prefer that you submit them to the general e-mail address that's provided [ECR@nsf.gov]. That way all of the program officers in the program will see that and it allows us to better coordinate our responses to you.

Edith Gummer: Here's the slide for the e-mail address again [ECR@nsf.gov] so if there are no further questions, we encourage you to submit your proposals to this competition, I think we're done.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Mark Leddy): Sorry, just one last question. If you are an evaluator on a proposal but not a PI, you are not in a position to review. There's a conflict of interest as you would be fiscally rewarded for any proposal that was funded where you were an evaluator.

(Claudia): I've already done the Survey Monkey questionnaire so what is the process after that and also are you considering people with no previous review panel experience such as myself?

Barry Sloane: So the process following the Survey Monkey would be that once we get the proposals, we'll know exactly what our needs are in terms of expertise. The fact that you haven't reviewed before will not be held against you; however, we will be looking at your CV and everybody else's CV to ensure that the reviewers have the adequate competencies for the proposals under review.

END May 14th Webinar and Q & A

START May 13th Webinar Q & A

(Carlos Handy): Yes, first question is the review panel will be made up of professionals primarily from what areas - education, social scientists? Will they be physical scientists? And the program managers themselves, what is their background? Are they scientist types? Are they social scientists, educators or policymakers? What exactly is their background?

(Mark Leddy): All areas - all expertise will be recognized on review panels and all areas will be addressed. That's primarily dependent upon the proposals that come in but all areas of STEM will be included.

(Carlos Handy): Okay, has anything like this been done before or is this a new initiative so to speak?

(Don Millard): So this is (Don Millard) responding now. We've had programs in the past that have touched on elements of this but what is distinctive about this particular program announcement is that it involves the entire directorate. This is not a division activity. This is the directorate wide activity.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

And to follow up on your prior question, the representatives group of program officers come from all four divisions within the directorate and come from quite a variety of backgrounds. You have the STEM disciplines fairly well represented amongst all the program officers, everyone from the education research communities and the disciplines as well as folks who have done extensive work in the development of implementations and actually brought projects to scale.

(Mark Grimes): Thank you for doing this. I participated in some Webinars a couple weeks ago and last week on - hosted by (TUES) and my question is this - is the role of an evaluator similarly emphasized as it is for the those types of education proposals previously funded by NSF?

(Edith Gummer): This is (Edith Gummer). The program announcement is relatively agnostic about the role of an external evaluator. However, we are pointed to the intellectual merit and broader impact review criteria to say that a proposal must have some mechanism to demonstrate that they work that is being undertaken is successful.

And so we are saying, again, agnostic on the nature of those mechanisms for assessments and you can consider potentially having a strong advisory board that can give a good judgment about the way in which the research is moving forward or you can hire an external evaluator.

(Mark Grimes): I see. I'm a cell biologist and I'm used to publications, you know, peer review publications being the mark for success. Does that count in the same way?

Woman: Peer review publications are an important product or outcome of the research that's being developed. But it's also important that as you're going along, that you have some [indicators] – that you have some mechanism to demonstrate the success of your work.

(Christina Filamin): Hi. I was wondering, what are the minimum requirements for a lead PI or a co-PI?

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Mark Leddy): I believe that the minimum requirement would be that the person adds value to the team and in taking a leadership role with the PI in the delivery of the proposal.

(Christina Filamin): Okay, but do they have to have some sort of PhD? Do they have to be a professor? Do they have to be at an established institution, things like that?

(Mark Leddy): They have to meet the requirements of the proposing institution, so each institution in the United States has different criteria for what that constitutes and you should follow the institutional criteria.

Woman: But again, I think the expertise that the PI brings in making sure that the work is successful is essential.

(Daniel Dallas): Yes, to what extent, if any, is development work feasible or appropriate for this solicitation relative to research? So you can research - when I think of peer research I think of looking at existing structures, existing projects or programs but then the development can be like a hothouse in which various things like related to workforce or whatever, developed and then researched or in terms of impacts and use for scale up.

So that's my first question. I had another one, too, about whether it is necessary to really spend pre-K lifelong learning in this given that it seems to be involving all the divisions? Or can there be a focus specifically on undergraduate or on, you know, a secondary level education or adult education?

Man: Well, with respect to development, this is meant to be an opportunity to really build our foundational research in the areas. So this is not one where we're looking at what may be referenced as implementation activities.

Now with that said, there's somewhat of a fuzzy line between the research and development that we're well aware of and there can be something where you're actually putting something in practice to be able to answer some key questions.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

But what we're really trying to be able to achieve here is to be able to come up with the understanding and improve the overall understanding of what types of practices or resources will really shift the field.

And we're looking at development as an opportunity to be able to measure and calibrate with what prior research activities have been in existence in the past.

As far as the level banding that you requested or you've asked about, you can address a specific level. There is nothing that prevents you from being able to look at, for example, just undergraduates or just a high school range or so on and so forth. You do not have to have your research adaptable or at least focusing on the entire range of pre-K through life.

(Edith Gummer): This is (Edith). I would like to add that from the development perspective, there are other programs that are still operating in - across EHR that have much more of a developmental focus. So for instance, in K-12 education, you might want to look at DR K-12, every research K-12.

And in formal science, you would want to look at the advancing in formal science learning. In the Division of [Undergraduate Education], you'll want to look at the undergraduate programs and the (CAUSE) program [if it is approved by Congress in the FY 2014 budget request.]

(Mark Leddy): And this is (Mark Leddy). I would like to add that the [program announcement] clearly states that projects that are already funded in those programs that are doing development may provide new and interesting implementation sites that could be used as subjects for research in ECR. So I think there's some clear language in the [program announcement] related to development. Thank you.

(Wendy Martin): Hi. Earlier you mentioned something about the quick turnaround time related to the IRB and possibly needing the IRB to be submitted with the proposal. So I just wanted to check in and see is there a specific start date? I don't think I noticed that in the RFT that you're looking for.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

Man: No, there isn't a specific start date, however, in order for us to be able to process awards in - using fiscal year '13 funds, we're going to need to be able to have the jackets completed when we send them down to our Division of Grants and Agreements.

Therefore, what we're going to need in terms of completion here is an IRB documentation package submitted with the proposals in order for us to be able to put them through processing.

In the past, what we were able to do at the end of the year is sometimes be able to put into a jacket when we submit them for funding, the potential for being able to do this after the fact. [We understand that] this is not the case anymore. So the documentation will have to be submitted along with those proposals.

(Wendy Martin): Okay, so the quick turnaround time is for your finalizing which things are selected but we could make the start date, say, January 1, 2014, would be reasonable?

Man: That's correct. And now, let me take the opportunity right now to be able to certainly emphasize for all of you that this is not a deadline. These are target dates. Therefore, if you want to be able to submit proposals now, feel free to do so.

It will allow us to be able to process them in a more rapid manner. Likewise, these target dates are not fixed in time in terms of when you have to submit something by for consideration.

They are target dates for us to be able to work around in terms of processing and assembling our panels to be able to do the peer review process. The current target date, or at least the target date that's near and dear to us right now is the July target date and we're focusing around that's particular date. If you can submit your proposals prior to that, that will certainly help us in the processing of these activities.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Hari Marayanan): Hi. My question is, you know, what is the difference between this program and REESE which, as I believe, is also foundational research oriented?

(Barry Sloane): Hi (Hari). Nice question.

(Barry Sloane): There are a number of things, really. One is as (Don Millard) acknowledged earlier, that this is a program of research across the whole directorate. That's the first difference. The second difference would be an emphasis on the workforce development component which doesn't re- which hasn't resided as a - from a research perspective within the directorate at large.

The REESE program, as currently configured, is under review and doesn't [currently] exist. So it will be sent out under a new solicitation we believe later this summer but the REESE program will look at the other three dimensions and exclude, at least in this iteration, workforce development.

(Barbara Burke): Hi. My question pertains to the difference between the core research proposal and the capacity building proposal. At a different level, I'm wondering whether - what the differences are. Is there a difference expected in the character of the education research itself or does it have merely to do with the scale, scope and duration of what is being proposed? And also, is it the latter, the capacity building project or appropriate to proof of concept research?

Man: That's a tricky question for us because we're working through it ourselves. However, certainly at the - the larger research is something that's ready to go. The capacity building research is still a research activity and looks more to notions of workshops, synthetic work so that at team would be ready to deliver on the larger type research and proposed in the program announcement.

(Mark Leddy): And this is (Mark). And/or it might add to the capacity building of the research communities so that if there was a consensus study that came out with a set of recommendations for future research, that would help address in future years what some of the basic core research would be about.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

The same could be said about the sand pits or the IdeasLabs. They might generate research ideas and help build capacity for those research ideas rather than conducting the research itself. Hopefully that's helpful.

(Stacy Mowry-Bretts): Hi, I have a question about something that struck me as missing from the call for proposal and that is that usually in the introduction to an RFP, there're typically many national reports that are cited and I guess when I saw this one come out, I expected to see something like the NRC report on disciplined based education research that came out cited, for example.

So I was just wondering, was that a purposeful omission, at least to it being a little bit more vague or are there particular reports that the RFP is shape around?

Man: Yes and no. Obviously the RFP is shaped around all the national reports. However, I think in this first iteration, there was this feeling that the response should be field initiated as opposed to initiated by the NRC or any other working body.

Man: So you choose to use those reports as you see fit, obviously, to make a case for the work you want to do or you choose to make a case irrespective of the reports drawing on your field initiated ideas.

(Debbie Peka): Good afternoon. I'm inquiring about where in the proposal submission process that you would attach an approved IRB.

Woman: On the cover page.

Man: On the cover page, there's a box to check. The box often has two hash marks that the IRB is either under review or it has been approved. And then if it has already been approved, please attach it with a - there would be a space for it to be attached [as a supplemental document].

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Mark Leddy): Just as a follow up - this is (Mark Leddy) - you could include those documents and supplemental documents. We would not reject that. If you had evidence of an IRB approval and you wanted to include that there, that would be fine, however, first we look on the cover page. So the cover page is the primary location where we'll be checking for IRB status. Thank you.

(Mary Fox): Hi and good afternoon. Is research appropriate under this program on issues of the existing professional STEM workforce compared to research on prospective workforce that is now in an earlier, that is, pre-professional stage?

Woman: Absolutely yes.

(Carlos Handy): Yes, hi. Okay, how do I want to phrase this? I have - I mean, I'm a physicist. I do research in mathematical physics. You know, it's been 30 years impacting HBCU student for STEM careers and stuff like that but I gather that this is a much more profound effort where you are essentially looking for proposals that could very well restructure how education is, you know, disseminating in the United States.

And so therefore, to that extent, it would seem to me that you would be prejudice towards institutions that have well founded schools of education, that in other words, have really - have been doing this kind of stuff for a while.

It's not like some guy off the street, so to speak, is going to advance his or her particular perspective on what's missing in American education. You want something that's more established?

Man: No, we want something that's innovative and we want something that's transformative and we want something that will significantly help move the fields forward.

And that includes original, basic educational research. I think anybody could come off the street who may have the expertise to do that and as long as they're associated with [an] organization [that] can submit a proposal.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

We welcome proposals from everyone and every institution that is capable of producing them. If they can bring us forward exceptional high quality work, that is our primary interest.

(Carlos Handy): Okay.

(Stacy Brett): Hi. I have a follow up question related to the concept of capacity building. In other NSF RFPs that phrase has been used to mean to develop scholars who can conduct research on STEM learning. Is that part of the conception here?

Man: No, that would overlap the other programs were that to be the case. Those programs are still in place. This is basically to underwrite research in this space so that we better understand how programs might be developed and understood.

(Stacy Brett): Okay, I wasn't aware that there were other programs still doing that or, for example, discipline based education research.

Man: (Don), do you want to respond to that?

(Don Millard): I think - yes, this is an area where if you have some type of study that you would like to be able to perform on how you build that disciplined based education research community, that would be something that we would be interested in actually pursuing.

Insomuch as there is some fundamental knowledge that could be imparted in trying to be able to understand what are the factors that actually do bring discipline based researcher into the educational domain to be able to perform some type of activity or implementation to be able to change the nature of the practices.

That's something that would then further build the knowledge base, and so that's something that we would actually want to be able to support as a result of this activity.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Stacy Brett): Thank you.

(Grace Johnson): Hi. My question is in regards to partnerships. What is your position on partnering and on - do you - basically would you encourage many of these entities to actually work together to come up with a collaborative strategy or a plan to move forward with in regards to the research or are you really interested in a bunch of varied proposals from numerous entities?

Man: Collaborative proposals are welcomed with this program announcement and so that necessarily would include partnerships with the right experts and the right institutions to conduct the work, so they're certainly welcome.

(Peggy Messaro): Is the total of the 28 awards that you're going to make for both submissions in July and February?

Man: No, just for July.

(Peggy Messaro): Okay, so 28 again in February?

Man: To be determined.

(Peggy Messaro): Okay.

Man: As well as the year thereafter.

Man: In fact, on the President's budget [request], there's a request to increase the amount of money to this particular program as time moves by, so 28 may be a minimum but we'll find out.

Man: And please understand that, don't lock us into the 28 number either. It's dependent upon what mix of proposals we get in at which levels that we get them in. So it could

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

be more or less awards that we do based upon what predominance of submissions are provided.

(Mark Leddy): I would add - this is (Mark) here - as a very clear statement as well, in the program announcement that says in some cases, co-funding with existing programs will be appropriate for awards. So should there be a situation where co-funding comes from other programs besides the ECR program, that could change the number of awards that we actually make.

(Peggy Messaro): Thank you.

(Paige Graph): Hi. I was wondering, I think in one of your slides you mentioned that prior support from NSF has to be included in your proposal. What if you do not have prior support from NSF? Are you still eligible to put in a proposal?

Man: You are absolutely eligible. And, in fact, under the 15 page limitation, [if you don't have prior support] it provides you more [pages] to make your case.

(Paige Graph): Okay great. Thanks.

[If a proposer has had prior NSF support they must include information on that support in the project description according to the NSF Grant Proposal Guide instructions: http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=gpg]

Woman: I would add, it would be helpful that if you [have had] prior NSF support, and this NSF support is [related] to your new proposal idea, that you do need to make statements concerning the impact in terms of broader impact and intellectual merit of this prior [support].

(Mark Leddy): And this is (Mark). If you have [not had] prior NSF support, I'd still like to see some evidence of [research activities] in your bio-sketch so I know what other areas you've had support in and whether or not you've done research along the same lines or not.

Transcript for the May 14th NSF EHR Core Research (ECR) Webinar Presentation and the Question and Answer sessions from the both May 13th and May 14th Webinars

(Paige Graph): Okay great. Thank you.

Man: Well, with that, what we'd really like to do is thank you for participating and again, we're going to stress to you that, again, we'll accept proposals from you at any date.

At this point, we'd like to be able to encourage you to submit them early and if you have any further follow up questions that you would like to be able to seek guidance on, please feel free to contact us either via the email address that we have or through contacts of one of the cognizant program officers. So with that, we're going to close today's session.

And again, thanks again for your participation and interest in the program. If you do want to be able to submit your name as a potential reviewer, you can access that from the site as well. So with that, we'll close, and again, have a good day.

END May 13th Webinar Q and A