

Computer Science for All (CSforAll: Research and RPPs)

PROGRAM SOLICITATION

NSF 20-539

REPLACES DOCUMENT(S):

NSF 18-537



National Science Foundation

Directorate for Education and Human Resources
Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings

Directorate for Computer and Information Science and Engineering
Division of Computing and Communication Foundations
Division of Information and Intelligent Systems
Division of Computer and Network Systems
Office of Advanced Cyberinfrastructure

Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

April 27, 2020

February 10, 2021

Second Wednesday in February, Annually Thereafter

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

- An additional strand has been added to allow proposals that focus on research into computer science teaching and learning.
- The list of cognizant program officers has been updated.

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the revised *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) (NSF 19-1), which is effective for proposals submitted, or due, on or after February 25, 2019.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

General Information

Program Title:

Computer Science for All (CSforAll: Research and RPPs)

Synopsis of Program:

This program aims to provide *all* U.S. students with the opportunity to participate in computer science (CS) and computational thinking (CT) education in their schools at the preK-12 levels. With this solicitation, the National Science Foundation (NSF) focuses on both research and researcher-practitioner partnerships (RPPs) that foster the research and development needed to bring CS and CT to all schools. Specifically, this solicitation aims to provide (1) **high school teachers** with the preparation, professional development (PD) and ongoing support they need to teach rigorous computer science courses; (2) **preK-8 teachers** with the instructional materials and preparation they need to integrate CS and CT into their teaching; and (3) **schools and districts** with the resources needed to define and evaluate multi-grade pathways in CS and CT.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

Please note that the following information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

- Jeffrey Forbes, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8950, email: jforbes@nsf.gov
- Michael Ford, EHR/DRL, telephone: (703) 292-5153, email: miford@nsf.gov
- Allyson Kennedy, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8950, email: aykenned@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):

- 47.070 --- Computer and Information Science and Engineering
- 47.076 --- Education and Human Resources

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 27

Approximately 8 small RPPs, 7 medium RPPs, 3 large RPPs, and 9 research awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$20,000,000

Subject to the availability of funds

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

The categories of proposers eligible to submit proposals to the National Science Foundation are identified in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG), Chapter I.E. Unaffiliated individuals are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this solicitation.

Who May Serve as PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Not required
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required
- **Full Proposals:**
 - Full Proposals submitted via FastLane: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) guidelines apply. The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.
 - Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) guidelines apply. The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.
 - Full Proposals submitted via Grants.gov: *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov* guidelines apply (Note: The *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide).

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.
- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**

Not Applicable
- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

Other budgetary limitations apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

April 27, 2020

February 10, 2021

Second Wednesday in February, Annually Thereafter

Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:

National Science Board approved criteria. Additional merit review criteria apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

Award Administration Information

Award Conditions:

Standard NSF award conditions apply.

Reporting Requirements:

Additional reporting requirements apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Program Requirements

- I. [Introduction](#)
- II. [Program Description](#)
- III. [Award Information](#)
- IV. [Eligibility Information](#)
- V. [Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions](#)
 - A. [Proposal Preparation Instructions](#)
 - B. [Budgetary Information](#)
 - C. [Due Dates](#)
 - D. [FastLane/Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements](#)
- VI. [NSF Proposal Processing and Review Procedures](#)
 - A. [Merit Review Principles and Criteria](#)
 - B. [Review and Selection Process](#)
- VII. [Award Administration Information](#)
 - A. [Notification of the Award](#)
 - B. [Award Conditions](#)
 - C. [Reporting Requirements](#)
- VIII. [Agency Contacts](#)
- IX. [Other Information](#)

I. INTRODUCTION

A key goal of this program is to provide *all* U.S. students with the opportunity to participate in computer science (CS) and computational thinking (CT) education in their schools at the preK-12 levels. CT refers to the thought processes involved in formulating problems and their solutions in such a way that the solutions can be effectively carried out by an information-processing agent (usually a computer) [1]. CT activities do not require the presence of a computing tool, but involve the requisite reasoning needed to capitalize on the use of computational tools. CS, as used in this solicitation, includes CT but also the broad range of understandings, competencies, and skills needed to apply computation in our digital world. It includes topics of problem specification and representation; algorithm development; software design, programming, and debugging; the Internet and networking; big data; cybersecurity; and application across a wide range of disciplines, including the associated societal impact and ethical considerations. This solicitation focuses on CS and CT instruction, as distinct from the mere use of computers or the use of common computational tools such as word processors or video editing or presentation software. The ability to use such tools is often referred to as computational literacy. This solicitation supports education beyond computational literacy.

"Building Computational Literacy" is one of four pathways identified in the 2018-2023 five-year plan for achieving the Federal government's three goals for STEM education, titled *Charting A Course for Success: America's Strategy for STEM Education*. A central purpose of this pathway is to "advance CT as a critical skill for today's world." "Make CT an integral element of all education" is one of three objectives under that pathway—and three key Federal actions are identified in the plan as needed to achieve this objective.

- "Increase the number of Federal funding and partnership opportunities that include CT as a selection criterion."
- "Support research and disseminate best practices on effective methods for teaching CT and computer science to young children as part of the STEM curriculum."
- "Identify and share education practices and curriculum materials that are effective at developing CT."

As the lead Federal agency for building the research knowledge base for CS and CT education, NSF aims to build upon past and ongoing efforts to

enable rigorous and engaging CS and CT education in schools across the Nation, including over \$20 million spent in FY 2019 in support of these efforts.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program supports (1) researcher-practitioner partnerships (RPPs) and (2) research with the goal of building knowledge from research and development to support efforts that aim to provide opportunities for *all* students to participate in CS and CT formal STEM learning at the pre-k, elementary, middle, and high school grade levels. Proposals will be funded in four “strands” that foster design, implementation at scale, and/or research:

RPP Strands:

- For the **High School Strand**, the focus is on preparing and supporting teachers to teach rigorous CS courses;
- For the **PreK-8 Strand**, the focus is on designing, developing, and piloting instructional materials that integrate CS and CT into preK-8 classrooms;
- For **preK-12** or **preK-14 Pathways Strand**, the focus is on designing pathways that support school districts in developing policies and supports for incorporating CS and CT across all grades and potentially into introductory levels at community or four-year colleges and universities.

Research Strand

For the **Research Strand**, the focus is on building strategically instrumental, or “high leverage” knowledge about the learning and teaching of introductory computer science to support key CS and CT understandings and abilities for all students.

A proposal can be submitted to only one strand, and that strand must be designated in the first line of the Project Summary.

To ensure that advances in computing education are inclusive of our diverse student populations (the “for All” part of “CS for All”), proposals on any strand **must** address, in a significant manner, longstanding underrepresentation in computing. Groups traditionally underrepresented or underserved in computing include women, minorities (e.g., African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders), students with disabilities, English language learners, and persons from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. **All proposals will be evaluated on the two additional Broadening Participation Criteria specific to this solicitation (see Section V.A, Project Description, below).**

Proposals in the **High School Strand, PreK-8 Strand, and the Pathways Strand** must come from RPPs, whereas proposals in the **Research Strand** are not subject to this requirement.

RPPs are defined in the literature as “long-term, mutualistic collaborations between practitioners and researchers that are intentionally organized to investigate problems of practice and solutions for improving district [and school] outcomes”^[1]. RPPs require well-organized teams of academic researchers and preK-12 practitioners (teachers, administrators, and counselors), possibly augmented with other community, foundation, policy, and industry partners. Members of these teams *work together to iteratively define and refine common goals, research questions, metrics, and implementations*. There are a variety of ways in which these RPPs can be organized. Examples include Research Alliances, Design-Based Implementation Research, and Networked Improvement Communities as described in the implementation and improvement science literature. See <http://researchandpractice.org/csforall> or the following links for resources on RPPs:

- <http://edr.sagepub.com/content/45/4/243.full.pdf+html>;
- [http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/under Improvement Resources](http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/under%20Improvement%20Resources);
- <http://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org/>;
- <http://researchandpractice.org/>; and
- <http://learndbir.org/>.

RPPs aim to strengthen the capacity of an organization to reliably produce valued CS and CT education outcomes for diverse groups of students, educated by different teachers in varied organizational contexts. The focus is on building efforts that can succeed when implemented at scale. These studies have less prescriptive research designs and methods, with research occurring in rapid, iterative, and context-expanding cycles. They require the deep engagement of researchers and practitioners during the collaborative research on problems of practice that are co-defined and of value to researchers and education agencies, such as a school district or community of schools. These types of projects seek to:

- study implementation in the local context;
- employ rapid changes in implementation with short-cycle methods;
- capitalize on variation in educational contexts to address the sources of variability in outcomes to understand what works, for whom, and under what conditions;
- address organizational structures and processes and their relation to innovation;
- employ measurement of change ideas, key drivers, and outcomes to continuously test working theories and to learn whether specific changes actually produce improvement; and
- reform the system in which the approach is being implemented as opposed to overlaying a specific approach on an existing system.

RPP Strands:

High School Strand. As schools attempt to respond to the increasing demand for CS and CT in their curricula, they are often faced with a critical shortage of teachers. Proposals in this strand should address key issues in the preparation, professional development (PD), and ongoing support of teachers of high school CS, recognizing the need for quickly scaling effective efforts to reach thousands of teachers, many of whom have had little or no formal CS preparation. Additional issues include but are not limited to:

- recruitment of teachers;
- differential PD based on prior experiences;
- creating robust PD materials for teachers and facilitators;
- establishing online and hybrid PD approaches;
- assessing the effectiveness of PD models with respect to content knowledge, pedagogy, classroom equity, and student outcomes;
- adapting and scaling PD models for greater impact, especially with respect to inclusion and equity;
- establishing certification programs and pre-service paths for teacher PD;

- undertaking studies to inform state or local policy about CS requirements; or
- designing, piloting and assessing scalable mechanisms for ongoing support of classroom teachers.

While the focus of the High School Strand is RPPs conducting implementation and improvement research on teacher preparation and support, it is possible within a project to adapt or enhance instructional materials for high school students. However, PIs are encouraged to focus their RPPs on studying supports for teachers who are interested in using instructional materials that already have been developed and piloted and are now scaling nationally, such as Exploring Computer Science (ECS), curricula based on the Advanced Placement® (AP) Computer Science Principles (CSP) framework, or Bootstrap, the curriculum for teaching mathematics and CS together. Strong proposals will document the wide use of the proposed instructional materials and include any available results about their effectiveness as part of the argument for focusing on the materials of choice, and they will address how findings from the research will inform practitioners' choices about CS and CT materials.

PreK-8 Strand. Thus far, there has been less attention paid to teaching CS and CT in preK-8 than in high school. RPPs proposed in this strand may address a wide range of topics on the teaching and learning of CS and CT in preK-8 grades, including but not limited to:

- development and study of prototype instructional materials for preK-8 both for stand-alone CS and CT courses or modules as well as teaching and testing of CS and CT concepts with other content;
- development of tools and models to support underrepresented students, including girls, in prekindergarten through elementary school in computer science education.
- creation of developmentally-appropriate learning progressions that underlie the design of instructional materials;
- design of classroom-based assessments to inform teaching and learning along the way; or
- development of PD and teacher support—including face-to-face and online learning communities, coaching, and mentoring— as needed for piloting of instructional materials, along with research about their use and effectiveness.

While RPPs focused on innovation in research and development of instructional materials for preK-8 are allowed, the investigators must make a clear case that curricula and materials do not currently exist to address the teaching and learning of CS and CT in the relevant grade levels or cannot be adapted to those contexts. Strong proposals must document how the new curricula or instructional materials differ in significant ways from already available materials and tools.

PreK-12/PreK-14 Pathways Strand. Many districts have begun to make progress at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, but need to coordinate the overall efforts, particularly to address articulation across the years of schooling. RPPs proposed in this strand may address the creation of pathways, including but not limited to:

- research and development of school district course pathways and alignment tools for students for preK-12;
- research and development on articulation from preK-12 to community or four-year colleges in preparation for entry into university CS or computationally intensive majors; or
- design and development of school, district, and/or state systems to assess and track student progress on pathways.

High-quality proposals in any strand will:

- delineate clearly the CS/CT content to be taught; address working with underrepresented or underserved communities, demonstrating knowledge of the relevant literature on working with the identified communities, and providing concrete plans of action and clear metrics for documenting outcomes [2];
- document the extent to which the approach has already scaled and its potential for further scaling; specify jointly-developed research questions and document the investment of the partners in those questions;
- provide work plans for implementation, improvement, data collection, analysis, and use; and
- draw from RPP literature on assessing/evaluating the quality of the partnership to articulate plans for assessing the success of the work of the RPP.

Projects in the RPP Strands should provide research results or findings on one or more of the following:

- strategies for improvement or implementation that address the shared goal of the researcher/practitioner collaborators;
- conceptual frameworks that address issues of scale, human capacity, and technical support for implementation and improvement in educational systems;
- measures of organizational learning that assess the progress of implementation and improvement;
- sustainable communities that can support implementation and improvement in the identified educational system; or
- documented practices with an ongoing forum for continued engagement of collaborators from various levels of the educational system.

Research Strand:

Supporting computer science education for all students requires a rich knowledge base about teaching and learning of computer science that extends beyond foci on organizational improvement that are typically addressed in RPPs, such as those listed above. The aim of the Research Strand is to support the development of a rich knowledge base that illuminates how learning in the domain of computer science best occurs and how it can be supported most effectively for all students. Advances in how scholars understand learning and instruction in other domains (e.g., natural sciences, mathematics, engineering) have, over time, underpinned improvements in curricula, standards, and instructional strategies in those domains. The Research Strand aims to support the same kinds of fundamental advances in understanding for computer science education.

Computer science is practiced through discrete technical and conceptual competencies and yet is contextualized in and necessarily integrated with aspects of other disciplinary domains and concerns in society. Advances in educational outcomes in computer science and computational thinking depend on expanded understandings of all phenomena related to the learning and teaching of computer science, considered broadly. The Research Strand supports scholarship that contributes to the growth of high-leverage knowledge bases that enable support for all students. High leverage knowledge bases are those that empower educators across diverse contexts to foster understandings, abilities, and habits of mind that are essential within an expanding role of computing in STEM disciplines and in society.

Like the RPP strands, the Research Strand has a primary focus on broadening participation in computer science. The stubbornly persistent problem of underrepresentation of many groups in postsecondary computer science disciplines reflects a broad lack of knowledge among educators about how diverse resources and needs of all pre-college students can be specifically addressed in models of learning and teaching. The Research Strand aims to enrich the knowledge base in ways that get "under the hood" of how pre-K-12/14 students build on what they know to learn computer science, such that educators can increase their ability to support all students to pursue a higher-level education in computer science, should they choose to do so. This focus should be incorporated into education research goals. It will not be sufficient, for example, to situate the work in schools with a high minority

enrollment, or to include a member of an underrepresented group on the project team. Although these are potentially important aspects of a proposal, successful Research Strand proposals will also describe the demographics of their intended participants, demonstrate knowledge of some relevant literature that pertains to roots of underrepresentation, have a plan that explores ways of improving representation, and have clear metrics and methodologies for documenting outcomes that would test and inform that plan. Underrepresented groups include women, minorities (e.g., African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders), students with disabilities, and English language learners, and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Proposals may focus on other underrepresented demographic groups or articulate a more general concern with broadening participation if they are able to justify their inclusion in the research plan compellingly.

Research proposals must focus on support for introductory, rather than advanced, learning in computer science. Topics that are typically taught in courses that require prerequisite coursework in computer science are not intended to be in focus for the Research Strand.

Areas of research can include but are not limited to:

- Fundamental knowledge about learning all aspects of introductory computer science (e.g., how students learn algorithms, how computational thinking can be supported, what introductory competencies are, how these competencies build on each other over time, how introductory competencies are learned in contexts of STEM disciplines, etc.)
- Aspirational learning goals in light of the expanding role of computing in society
- Models of reasoning in computer science as they relate to reasoning in natural sciences, health sciences, mathematics, social sciences, ethics, business, etc.
- Pathways from K-12 into community colleges and community colleges into the tech workforce and/or into 4-year institutions (e.g. metrics of student success, models of student support through the “bridge” points of the pathway, how community colleges manage the dual role of workforce training and transfer to 4-year programs, etc.)
- Computer science literacy, both in terms of reading and writing code and more expansively in terms of reasoning computationally about issues in disciplinary domains and society
- Challenges faced by, and resources possessed by, students from groups currently underrepresented in computer science disciplines
- How computer science learning can be framed in ways that invite, value, and build on students’ diverse cultural and linguistic resources
- How overly competitive or “defensive” classroom climates are cultivated, how this impacts learning outcomes, and strategies to foster collaboration and an inclusive climate among students
- Associations between particular instructional strategies and student learning
- Teacher knowledge and its development for teaching computer science to all students

The Research Strand aims to bring to bear research expertise, approaches and tools from scholarship on learning from other domains as appropriate, including but not limited to cognitive science, learning sciences, STEM education, social studies education, and ethics education.

The Research Strand encourages a broad array of methodological approaches as appropriate for addressing research questions. Research can be conducted as part of development efforts (e.g., design-based research), but will be reviewed in light of the research, rather than development, goals. That is, proposals should clearly outline research aims as contextualized in development efforts. As such, proposals will be judged in terms of how well research questions are framed and motivated, the extent to which the research questions address an area of high leverage for supporting computer science education, whether and how the methods are appropriate for addressing them, and how analyses will lead to the kinds of inferences sought. Competitive proposals will articulate clearly what will be learned from the research and how the new knowledge will expand educational capacities in computer science. *We encourage collaboration between those working in preK-14 computer science and computational thinking, learning sciences, cognitive science, STEM education research, psychology, sociology, and other relevant disciplines.*

Proposal size classes:

Proposals in the RPP and Research Strands may be submitted in the following **size classes**:

- **Small RPP** proposals (maximum of \$300,000 for up to 2 years) are designed to support the initial steps in establishing a strong and well-integrated RPP team that could successfully compete for a Medium or Large proposal in the near future.
- **Medium RPP** proposals (maximum of \$1,000,000 for up to 3 years) are designed to support the modest scaling of a promising approach by a well-defined RPP team.
- **Large RPP** proposals (maximum of \$2,000,000 for up to 4 years) are designed to support the widespread scaling of an evidence-based approach by a RPP team that builds on prior collaborations.
- **Research** proposals (maximum of \$500,000 for up to 3 years) are designed to support research projects.

The size class should be specified in the first line of the Project Summary.

Co-Funding Opportunities for this Solicitation:

NSF may enter into partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and organizations interested in co-funding projects submitted to this solicitation. Principal Investigators (PIs) on proposals that meet the general eligibility requirements of one or more of these partners will be contacted by the cognizant NSF program director following submission of their proposals, and be given the option of having their proposals considered jointly by NSF and the partner(s). If a PI so chooses, a given partner’s representatives will have access to the corresponding proposal, be invited to sit in on the NSF review panel’s discussion of that proposal, and be able to discuss the reviews with the NSF CSforAll: Research and RPPs Program Directors. This consideration by one or more partners will be strictly optional; PIs who choose not to avail themselves of this option will have their proposals reviewed solely by NSF.

The CISE Division of Computer and Network Systems (CNS) and EHR Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings (DRL) will be responsible for receiving submitted proposals, determining compliance of proposals with the guidelines specified in the program solicitation, selecting proposals for NSF funding, and negotiating the award budgets. Once NSF’s decisions on funding have been made, relevant partner(s) will be able to choose to co-fund any of the awards that were submitted for their consideration.

An updated list of partners, including partner-specific eligibility requirements, will be maintained on the CSforAll: Research and RPPs program webpage.

References

[1] Coburn, C.E., Penuel, W.R., & Geil, K.E. (January 2013). Research-Practice Partnerships: A Strategy for Leveraging Research for Educational Improvement in School Districts. William T. Grant Foundation, New York, NY, pg. 2.

[2] Proposers are encouraged to leverage the resources of the Broadening Participation in Computing Alliances: https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=503593.

[3] <http://www.exploringcs.org/>

[4] <https://apcentral.collegeboard.org/courses/ap-computer-science-principles>

[5] <https://www.bootstrapworld.org/>

III. AWARD INFORMATION

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 27 (approximately 8 small RPP, 7 medium RPP, 3 large RPP, 9 research) awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$20,000,000

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Submit Proposals:

The categories of proposers eligible to submit proposals to the National Science Foundation are identified in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG), Chapter I.E. Unaffiliated individuals are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this solicitation.

Who May Serve as PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Full Proposal Preparation Instructions: Proposers may opt to submit proposals in response to this Program Solicitation via FastLane, Research.gov, or Grants.gov.

- Full proposals submitted via FastLane: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. Proposers are reminded to identify this program solicitation number in the program solicitation block on the NSF Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.
- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.
- Full proposals submitted via Grants.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation via Grants.gov should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov*. The complete text of the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide. To obtain copies of the Application Guide and Application Forms Package, click on the Apply tab on the Grants.gov site, then click on the Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Application Instructions link and enter the funding opportunity number, (the program solicitation number without the NSF prefix) and press the Download Package button. Paper copies of the Grants.gov Application Guide also may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

In determining which method to utilize in the electronic preparation and submission of the proposal, please note the following:

Collaborative Proposals. All collaborative proposals submitted as separate submissions from multiple organizations must be submitted via the NSF FastLane system. PAPPG Chapter II.D.3 provides additional information on collaborative proposals.

See PAPPG Chapter II.C.2 for guidance on the required sections of a full research proposal submitted to NSF. Please note that the proposal preparation instructions provided in this program solicitation may deviate from the PAPPG instructions.

COVER SHEET:

Proposals responding to this solicitation will likely be working with Human Subjects (looking at outcomes for teachers, students or both). If that is the case, on the cover sheet, mark the **Human Subjects** box as pending, approved, or exempted (with exemption subsection indicated). **This box should not be left blank.** The **Human Subjects** box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of "approved" or "exempt", or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5.

PROJECT SUMMARY:

The Project Summary consists of an overview, a statement on the intellectual merit of the proposed activity, and a statement on the broader impacts of the proposed activity.

The first line of the Project Summary should identify the proposal strand: **High School Strand, PreK-8 Strand, PreK-12/PreK-14 Pathways Strand, or Research Strand.** Proposals to the RPP strands also should list the size class (Small, Medium or Large).

Please provide between two and six sets of keywords at the end of the overview in the Project Summary. EHR and CISE personnel will use this information in implementing the merit review process. The keywords should describe the main scientific/engineering areas explored in the proposal. Keywords should be prefaced with "Keywords" followed by a colon, and should be separated by semi-colons. Keywords should be of the type used to describe research in a journal submission, and may include technical areas of expertise necessary to review the proposal.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This program solicitation is particularly interested in broadening participation in CS and CT for groups that have been traditionally underrepresented or underserved in CS. All proposals must explicitly address broadening participation with respect to the two Additional Criteria:

1. Does the proposal identify the characteristics and needs of the identified underrepresented or underserved groups (public or professional) to be served?
2. Does the proposal include specific plans or strategies for addressing or accommodating the particular needs of participants of the identified underrepresented or underserved groups?

Reviewers will be asked to specifically evaluate the proposal on these two criteria as well as the two standard NSF Merit Review Criteria (Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts). Proposals that do not adequately address these additional criteria will be declined.

RPP Strands

In addition to the guidance provided in the PAPPG on Project Description preparation, the Project Description for Medium and Large size classes in the RPP Strands must also:

- specify initial, jointly-developed research questions and document the investment of the partners in those questions;
- provide work plans for implementation, data collection, analysis, improvement, and use;
- describe the management and administrative structures with the capacity to administer the program; and
- draw from RPP literature on assessing/evaluating the quality of the partnership to articulate plans for assessing the success of the work of the RPP.

Medium and Large projects in the RPP Strands must include an evaluation plan that describes appropriate mechanisms to assess success through project-specific external review and feedback processes. All projects must have external, critical reviews of their designs and activities (including their theoretical frameworks, as well as data collection, analysis, and reporting plans). These might include an external review panel or advisory board proposed by the project or a third-party evaluator. The external critical review should be sufficiently independent and rigorous to influence the project's activities and improve the quality of its findings. Successful proposals will (1) describe the expertise of the external reviewer(s); (2) explain how that expertise relates to the goals and objectives of the proposal; and (3) specify how the PI will report and use results of the project's external, critical review process. Proposers may wish to consider resources on evaluating RPPs, such as <https://rpp.wgrantfoundation.org/topic/evaluating-partnerships-for-improvement-and-impact/>.

For Small size class proposals in the RPP Strands, the Project Description must describe:

- what is known about the issue to be investigated;
- the contributions of collaborators representing multiple perspectives;
- how the development of the collaboration will have the potential to result in a future RPP with education researchers, experts in CS/CT and schools or districts;
- the steps to build effective collaborations for achieving the project goals;
- the evaluation plan, and
- the steps and actions to further refine and develop the research question(s) and methods or design and development approaches, leveraging the expertise of the collaborators.

Research Strand

For proposals in the Research Strand, the Project Description must describe:

- Clear connections to previous research. Proposals in this strand must be grounded in literatures that are arguably relevant to the research questions being pursued.
- A clear research plan. Proposals must include research questions that are compellingly motivated and that would contribute to a knowledge

base that supports broadening participation in computer science. Proposals must include a detailed and appropriate plan for how all data will be analyzed to address the research questions. The research plan must be presented with enough detail to allow for their evaluation during review.

- A compelling explanation for how the research plan will fill an important need in the existing knowledge base about learning and teaching of computer science
- An evaluation plan to assess success of the project. Projects are expected to document, and report progress toward the accomplishment of its research goals. Proposals must include plans for soliciting—and addressing—objective external feedback (e.g., through an advisory board, peer review, or other mechanism).
- A plan for dissemination. Proposals must include a strategy for reaching a broad audience with the findings of the project including, where appropriate, researchers in other fields, practitioners, policy makers, and public audiences

SPECIAL INFORMATION AND SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS:

List of Project Personnel

In addition to guidance provided in the PAPPG on required Special Information and Supplementary Documents, provide current, accurate information for all personnel and institutions involved in the project. NSF staff will use this information in the merit review process to manage reviewer selection. The list should include all PIs, Co-PIs, Senior Personnel, paid/unpaid Consultants or Collaborators, Subawardees, Postdocs, and project-level advisory committee members. This list should be numbered and include (in this order) Full name, Organization(s), and Role in the project, with each item separated by a semi-colon. Each person listed should start a new line. For example:

- Mary Smith; XYZ University; PI
- John Jones; University of PQR; Senior Personnel
- Jane Brown; XYZ University; Postdoc
- Bob Adams; ABC Community College; Paid Consultant
- Susan White; DEF Corporation; Unpaid Collaborator Tim Green; ZZZ University; Subawardee

SINGLE COPY DOCUMENTS:

Collaborators and Other Affiliations Information:

Proposers should follow the guidance specified in Chapter II.C.1.e of the NSF PAPPG. Grants.gov Users: The COA information must be provided through use of the COA template and uploaded as a PDF attachment.

Note the distinction to the Project Personnel specified above under Special Information and Supplementary Documents: the listing of all project participants is collected by the project lead and entered as a Supplementary Document, which is then automatically included with all proposals in a project. The Collaborators and Other Affiliations are entered for each participant within each proposal and, as Single Copy Documents, these are available only to NSF staff.

SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

In an effort to assist proposal preparation, the following checklists are provided as a reminder of the items that should be checked before submitting a CSforAll: RPP and Research proposal to this solicitation. These are a summary of the requirements described above. For the items marked with (RWR), the proposal will be returned without review if the required item is noncompliant at the submission deadline. Note that there are five lists: (1) for all proposals, unique to this solicitation; (2) for all proposals, selected items from the PAPPG; (3) additional requirements for Small proposals; (4) additional requirements for Medium proposals; and (5) additional requirements for Large proposals.

For all proposals, regardless of size:

On the cover sheet, mark the Human Subjects box as pending, approved, or exempted (with exemption subsection indicated). This box should not be left blank. The Human Subjects box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of "approved" or "exempt"; or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in the [PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5](#).

The first line of the overview of the Project Summary must indicate the proposal strand and size class from among the options specified in the Program Description of this solicitation.

The last line of the Project Summary should consist of the word "Keywords" followed by a colon and between 2-6 keywords, separated by semi-colons.

In addition to addressing Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts, all proposals must address the two additional broadening participation criteria listed above under "Project Description. A list of Project Personnel should be included as a Supplementary Document.

Letters of Collaboration are permitted as Supplementary Documents. *Letters of Support are not allowed; reviewers will be instructed not to consider those letters in reviewing the merits of the proposal.*

(RWR) All proposals must address evaluation plans.

For Small proposals:

(RWR) The budget shown on the cover page and on the budget sheets must not exceed two years or \$300,000, plus funds for embedded REU (Research Experiences for Undergraduates) supplements.

For Medium proposals:

(RWR) The budget shown on the cover page and on the budget sheets must not exceed three years or \$1,000,000, plus funds for embedded REU supplements.

For Large proposals:

(RWR) The budget shown on the cover page and on the budget sheets must not exceed four years or \$2,000,000, plus funds for embedded REU supplements.

Proposals that do not comply with the requirements noted by RWR will be returned without review.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:

Budget restrictions for strands as noted in the section on Submission Checklist

Budget Preparation Instructions:

Projects should budget to have two members attend a meeting of principal investigators annually.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

April 27, 2020

February 10, 2021

Second Wednesday in February, Annually Thereafter

D. FastLane/Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via FastLane or Research.gov:

To prepare and submit a proposal via FastLane, see detailed technical instructions available at: <https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm>. To prepare and submit a proposal via Research.gov, see detailed technical instructions available at: https://www.research.gov/research-portal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Service/Desktop/ProposalPreparationandSubmission.html. For FastLane or Research.gov user support, call the FastLane and Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-673-6188 or e-mail fastlane@nsf.gov or rgov@nsf.gov. The FastLane and Research.gov Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the FastLane and Research.gov systems. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this funding opportunity.

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once registered, the applicant's organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website. Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage: <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants.html>. In addition, the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide (see link in Section V.A) provides instructions regarding the technical preparation of proposals via Grants.gov. For Grants.gov user support, contact the Grants.gov Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or by email: support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Contact Center answers general technical questions related to the use of Grants.gov. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this solicitation.

Submitting the Proposal: Once all documents have been completed, the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) must submit the application to Grants.gov and verify the desired funding opportunity and agency to which the application is submitted. The AOR must then sign and submit the application to Grants.gov. The completed application will be transferred to the NSF FastLane system for further processing.

Proposers that submitted via FastLane or Research.gov may use Research.gov to verify the status of their submission to NSF. For proposers that submitted via Grants.gov, until an application has been received and validated by NSF, the Authorized Organizational Representative may check the status of an application on Grants.gov. After proposers have received an e-mail notification from NSF, Research.gov should be used to check the status of an application.

VI. NSF PROPOSAL PROCESSING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Proposals received by NSF are assigned to the appropriate NSF program for acknowledgement and, if they meet NSF requirements, for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an NSF Program Officer, and usually by three to ten other persons outside NSF either as *ad hoc* reviewers, panelists, or both, who are experts in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with oversight of the review process. Proposers are invited to suggest names of persons they believe are especially well qualified to review the proposal and/or persons they would prefer not review the proposal. These suggestions may serve as one source in the reviewer selection process at the Program Officer's discretion. Submission of such names, however, is optional. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition, Program Officers may obtain comments from site visits before recommending final action on proposals. Senior NSF staff further review recommendations for awards. A flowchart that depicts the entire NSF proposal and award process

(and associated timeline) is included in PAPPG Exhibit III-1.

A comprehensive description of the Foundation's merit review process is available on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/.

Proposers should also be aware of core strategies that are essential to the fulfillment of NSF's mission, as articulated in *Building the Future: Investing in Discovery and Innovation - NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years (FY) 2018 – 2022*. These strategies are integrated in the program planning and implementation process, of which proposal review is one part. NSF's mission is particularly well-implemented through the integration of research and education and broadening participation in NSF programs, projects, and activities.

One of the strategic objectives in support of NSF's mission is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions must recruit, train, and prepare a diverse STEM workforce to advance the frontiers of science and participate in the U.S. technology-based economy. NSF's contribution to the national innovation ecosystem is to provide cutting-edge research under the guidance of the Nation's most creative scientists and engineers. NSF also supports development of a strong science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce by investing in building the knowledge that informs improvements in STEM teaching and learning.

NSF's mission calls for the broadening of opportunities and expanding participation of groups, institutions, and geographic regions that are underrepresented in STEM disciplines, which is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

The National Science Foundation strives to invest in a robust and diverse portfolio of projects that creates new knowledge and enables breakthroughs in understanding across all areas of science and engineering research and education. To identify which projects to support, NSF relies on a merit review process that incorporates consideration of both the technical aspects of a proposed project and its potential to contribute more broadly to advancing NSF's mission "to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes." NSF makes every effort to conduct a fair, competitive, transparent merit review process for the selection of projects.

1. Merit Review Principles

These principles are to be given due diligence by PIs and organizations when preparing proposals and managing projects, by reviewers when reading and evaluating proposals, and by NSF program staff when determining whether or not to recommend proposals for funding and while overseeing awards. Given that NSF is the primary federal agency charged with nurturing and supporting excellence in basic research and education, the following three principles apply:

- All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- NSF projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals. These "Broader Impacts" may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified.
- Meaningful assessment and evaluation 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. If the size of the activity is limited, evaluation of that activity in isolation is not likely to be meaningful. Thus, assessing the effectiveness of these activities may best be done at a higher, more aggregated, level than the individual project.

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of those activities.

These three merit review principles provide the basis for the merit review criteria, as well as a context within which the users of the criteria can better understand their intent.

2. Merit Review Criteria

All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of the two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities.

The two merit review criteria are listed below. **Both** criteria are to be given **full consideration** during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria. (PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i). contains additional information for use by proposers in development of the Project Description section of the proposal). Reviewers are strongly encouraged to review the criteria, including PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i), prior to the review of a proposal.

When evaluating NSF proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit:** The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and
- **Broader Impacts:** The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
 - a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
 - b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a

- mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
 5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. NSF values the advancement of scientific knowledge and activities that contribute to achievement of societally relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and underrepresented minorities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); improved STEM education and educator development at any level; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive STEM workforce; increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others; improved national security; increased economic competitiveness of the United States; and enhanced infrastructure for research and education.

Proposers are reminded that reviewers will also be asked to review the Data Management Plan and the Postdoctoral Researcher Mentoring Plan, as appropriate.

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

This program solicitation is particularly interested in broadening participation in CS and CT for groups traditionally underrepresented or underserved in CS. In addition to considering the two general NSF Merit Review Criteria, reviewers will also be asked to evaluate the following:

1. Does the proposal identify the characteristics and needs of the identified underrepresented or underserved groups to be addressed?
2. Does the proposal include specific plans or strategies for addressing or accommodating the particular needs of participants of the identified underrepresented groups?

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by Ad hoc Review and/or Panel Review, or see below for Co-Funding Review.

NSF may enter into partnerships with other agencies, foundations, and organizations interested in co-funding projects submitted to this solicitation. Principal Investigators (PIs) on proposals that meet the general eligibility requirements of one or more of these partners will be contacted by the cognizant NSF program director following submission of their proposals, and be given the option of having their proposals considered jointly by NSF and the partner(s). If a PI so chooses, a given partner's representatives will have access to the corresponding proposal, be invited to sit in on the NSF review panel's discussion of that proposal, and be able to discuss the reviews with the NSF CSforAll: Research and RPP Program Directors. This consideration by one or more partners will be strictly optional; PIs who choose not to avail themselves of this option will have their proposals reviewed solely by the NSF.

The CISE Division of Computer and Network Systems (CNS) and EHR Division of Research on Learning in Formal and Informal Settings (DRL) will be responsible for receiving submitted proposals, determining compliance of proposals with the guidelines specified in the program solicitation, selecting proposals for NSF funding, and negotiating the award budgets. Once NSF's decisions on funding have been made, relevant partner(s) will be able to choose to co-fund any of the awards that were submitted for their consideration.

An updated list of partners, including partner-specific eligibility requirements, will be maintained on the CSforAll: Research and RPP program webpage.

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two National Science Board approved merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer's recommendation.

After programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications. After an administrative review has occurred, Grants and Agreements Officers perform the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at their own risk.

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two National Science Board approved merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer's recommendation.

After programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications. After an administrative review has occurred, Grants and Agreements Officers perform the

processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at their own risk.

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to *the submitting organization* by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See Section VI.B. for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award notice, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3) the proposal referenced in the award notice; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (GC-1)*; or Research Terms and Conditions* and (5) any announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award notice. Cooperative agreements also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Financial and Administrative Terms and Conditions (CA-FATC) and the applicable Programmatic Terms and Conditions. NSF awards are electronically signed by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer and transmitted electronically to the organization via e-mail.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's Website at https://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the NSF *Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the Principal Investigator must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer no later than 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. (Some programs or awards require submission of more frequent project reports). No later than 120 days following expiration of a grant, the PI also is required to submit a final project report, and a project outcomes report for the general public.

Failure to provide the required annual or final project reports, or the project outcomes report, will delay NSF review and processing of any future funding increments as well as any pending proposals for all identified PIs and co-PIs on a given award. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

PIs are required to use NSF's electronic project-reporting system, available through Research.gov, for preparation and submission of annual and final project reports. Such reports provide information on accomplishments, project participants (individual and organizational), publications, and other specific products and impacts of the project. Submission of the report via Research.gov constitutes certification by the PI that the contents of the report are accurate and complete. The project outcomes report also must be prepared and submitted using Research.gov. This report serves as a brief summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project. This report will be posted on the NSF website exactly as it is submitted by the PI.

More comprehensive information on NSF Reporting Requirements and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

Projects will be required to maintain a website, attend annual PI meetings, and participate in a common evaluation where appropriate.

VIII. AGENCY CONTACTS

Please note that the program contact information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:

- Jeffrey Forbes, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8950, email: jforbes@nsf.gov
- Michael Ford, EHR/DRL, telephone: (703) 292-5153, email: miford@nsf.gov
- Allyson Kennedy, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8950, email: aykenned@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of FastLane or Research.gov, contact:

- FastLane and Research.gov Help Desk: 1-800-673-6188

FastLane Help Desk e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.

Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: rgov@nsf.gov

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:

- Grants.gov Contact Center: If the Authorized Organizational Representatives (AOR) has not received a confirmation message from Grants.gov within 48 hours of submission of application, please contact via telephone: 1-800-518-4726; e-mail: support@grants.gov.

IX. OTHER INFORMATION

The NSF website provides the most comprehensive source of information on NSF Directorates (including contact information), programs and funding opportunities. Use of this website by potential proposers is strongly encouraged. In addition, "NSF Update" is an information-delivery system designed to keep potential proposers and other interested parties apprised of new NSF funding opportunities and publications, important changes in proposal and award policies and procedures, and upcoming NSF [Grants Conferences](#). Subscribers are informed through e-mail or the user's Web browser each time new publications are issued that match their identified interests. "NSF Update" also is available on [NSF's website](#).

Grants.gov provides an additional electronic capability to search for Federal government-wide grant opportunities. NSF funding opportunities may be accessed via this mechanism. Further information on Grants.gov may be obtained at <https://www.grants.gov>.

Related Programs:

ABOUT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent Federal agency created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 USC 1861-75). The Act states the purpose of the NSF is "to promote the progress of science; [and] to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare by supporting research and education in all fields of science and engineering."

NSF funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K-12 school systems, businesses, informal science organizations and other research organizations throughout the US. The Foundation accounts for about one-fourth of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

NSF receives approximately 55,000 proposals each year for research, education and training projects, of which approximately 11,000 are funded. In addition, the Foundation receives several thousand applications for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. The agency operates no laboratories itself but does support National Research Centers, user facilities, certain oceanographic vessels and Arctic and Antarctic research stations. The Foundation also supports cooperative research between universities and industry, US participation in international scientific and engineering efforts, and educational activities at every academic level.

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASSED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* Chapter II.E.6 for instructions regarding preparation of these types of proposals.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090 and (800) 281-8749, FIRS at (800) 877-8339.

The National Science Foundation Information Center may be reached at (703) 292-5111.

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Website at <https://www.nsf.gov>

- **Location:** 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314
- **For General Information** (NSF Information Center): (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090

- **To Order Publications or Forms:**

Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov

or telephone: (703) 292-7827

- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding applicants or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See [System of Record Notices](#), NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records." Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding the burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

Suzanne H. Plimpton
Reports Clearance Officer
Office of the General Counsel
National Science Foundation
Alexandria, VA 22314

[Policies and Important Links](#) | [Privacy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [Help](#) | [Contact NSF](#) | [Contact Web Master](#) | [SiteMap](#)



National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, USA
Tel: (703) 292-5111, FIRS: (800) 877-8339 | TDD: (703) 292-5090 or (800) 281-8749

[Text Only](#)