

IUSE / Professional Formation of Engineers: REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments (IUSE/PFE: RED)

PROGRAM SOLICITATION

NSF 17-501

REPLACES DOCUMENT(S):
NSF 15-607



National Science Foundation

Directorate for Engineering
Engineering Education and Centers
Division of Electrical, Communications and Cyber Systems
Division of Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental and Transport Systems
Division of Civil, Mechanical and Manufacturing Innovation
Industrial Innovation and Partnerships

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

Directorate for Education & Human Resources
Division of Undergraduate Education
Division of Human Resource Development

Letter of Intent Due Date(s) (required) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

December 09, 2016

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

January 18, 2017

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

Added the eligibility restriction: Institutions that have previously received a RED award are not eligible to receive an award under this solicitation.

Added the restriction: An institution may receive only one award under this solicitation.

Provided additional clarification on what is and is not allowed in the Supplementary Documents.

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the revised *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) ([NSF 17-1](#)), which is effective for proposals submitted, or due, on or after January 30, 2017.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

General Information

Program Title:

IUSE/Professional Formation of Engineers: REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments
(IUSE/PFE: RED)

Synopsis of Program:

In FY 2017, NSF is continuing a program aligned with the Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) framework: *REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments*. This funding opportunity enables engineering and computer science departments to lead the nation by successfully achieving significant sustainable changes necessary to overcome longstanding issues in their undergraduate programs and educate inclusive communities of engineering and computer science students prepared to solve 21st-century challenges.

In 2014, ENG launched an initiative, the *Professional Formation of Engineers* (PFE), to create and support an innovative and inclusive engineering profession for the 21st century. At the same time, in 2014, NSF launched the

agency-wide Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) framework, which is a comprehensive effort to accelerate improvements in the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate education in all STEM fields. The RED program was first offered in FY 2015 as a PFE initiative aligned with the IUSE framework. Additional programs have been created within the IUSE framework across NSF, such as the IUSE: EHR program within EHR.

Even as demographic and regional socioeconomic factors affect engineering and computer science departments in unique ways, there are certain tenets of sustainable change that are common across institutions. For instance, the development and engagement of the entire faculty within a department are paramount to the process, and faculty must be incentivized. Departmental cultural barriers to change and to inclusion of students *and* faculty from different backgrounds must be identified and addressed. Finally, coherent technical and professional threads must be developed and woven across the four years, especially (1) in the core technical courses of the middle two years, (2) in internship opportunities in the private and public sectors, and (3) in research opportunities with faculty. These and other threads aim to ensure that students develop deep knowledge in their discipline more effectively and meaningfully, while at the same time building their capacities for 21st century and “T-shaped” professional skills, including design, leadership, communication, understanding historical and contemporary social contexts, lifelong learning, professional ethical responsibility, creativity, entrepreneurship, and multidisciplinary teamwork. It is expected that, over time, the awardees of this program will create knowledge concerning sustainable change in engineering and computer science education that can be scaled and adopted nationally across a wide variety of academic institutions. The research on departmental change that results from these projects should inform change more broadly across the STEM disciplines.

Note: The RED program is offered in alignment with the NSF-wide undergraduate STEM education initiative, *Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE)*. More information about IUSE can be found in the Introduction of this solicitation. The IUSE/PFE: RED program will hereafter be referred to as RED.

Prospective PIs are encouraged to consider the IUSE: EHR program for projects that are outside the scope of RED (see https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505082). Specifically, the Institutional and Community Transformation (ICT) track promotes innovative approaches to using research to catalyze change that addresses challenges across and within institutions (institutional transformation), as well as within and across specific disciplines (community transformation).

Prospective PIs are strongly discouraged from submitting identical or substantially similar proposals to RED and IUSE: EHR.

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.

- Kamau Bobb, Program Director, Division of Computer and Network Systems, Directorate for Computer & Information Science & Engineering, telephone: (703) 292-4291, email: kbobb@nsf.gov
- Elliot Douglas, Program Director, Division of Engineering Education and Centers, Directorate for Engineering, telephone: (703) 292-7051, email: edouglas@nsf.gov
- Olga Pierrakos, Program Director, Division of Undergraduate Education, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, telephone: (703) 292-7936, email: olpierra@nsf.gov

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

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

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award:

Standard Grant or Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards:

6 to 8

Six to eight awards will be made, each in an amount from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 total for a duration of up to 5 years. Proposals with budgets that fall outside of these limits will be returned without review. The estimated program budget and number of awards are subject to the availability of funds and the quality of proposals received.

Anticipated Funding Amount:

\$11,950,000

Estimated program budget and number of awards are subject to the availability of funds.

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Universities and Colleges - Universities and two- and four-year colleges (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in, the US acting on behalf of their faculty members. Such organizations also are referred to as academic institutions.

Who May Serve as PI:

The Principal Investigator must be a department chair/head (or equivalent) to establish institutional accountability. There must be a RED team that includes (at a minimum) an expert in engineering education or computer science education research who can ground the research plan in the literature, and a social science expert who can advise on strategies for developing a culture of change and on strategies for creating meaningful collective ownership of the effort among faculty, students, and staff. The social scientist must have the expertise to evaluate departmental dynamics and monitor change processes.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

2

An organization is allowed up to two submissions per competition.

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

1

An individual may serve as PI or co-PI on only one submission per competition.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Submission of Letters of Intent is required. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.
- **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=papp.
 - 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: http://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

- **Letter of Intent Due Date(s) (required)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

December 09, 2016
- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

January 18, 2017

Proposal Review Information Criteria<

Merit Review Criteria:

National Science Board approved criteria. Additional merit review considerations 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/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

Over the past several decades various studies, reports, and initiatives on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and diversity were led by the National Science Board, the National Academies, the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, the President's Council on Jobs and Competitiveness, think tanks, and others. Over time, the messages are similar, and in some cases identical. They have brought to the forefront the acute awareness of national grand challenges and of the structural disconnect between STEM workforce needs and student engagement and preparation to meet those needs. However, many of these studies explore STEM more broadly and not the unique aspects of "S," "T," "E," and "M."

The "E" in STEM, Engineering, has many unique aspects. Engineers' abilities in design and systems thinking enable them to utilize their integrative, creative capacity to leverage technology in improving quality of life for people and sustainability of the environment. Because of engineers' immediate ability to contribute professionally upon graduation, the BS degree in engineering (including software engineering) is distinctive as a professional degree with eligibility to qualify for the Professional Engineer (PE) license [1].

With respect to computer science, the growing support for "CS+X" curricular approaches acknowledges the intersection of computer science and other disciplines, including the humanities. CS+X majors acknowledge the increasingly ubiquitous nature of computing, with applications in virtually any field imaginable, and allow students to tackle the increasingly complicated socio-technical challenges that will confront them professionally. Additionally, the array of engagement and recruitment efforts over the last several years has resulted in a surge of enrollment in CS departments across the country. Undergraduate institutions must devise innovative means of offering effective CS education to a much larger student body.

Furthermore, in the high-tech environment upon which the global economy is based, the perennial debate about workforce shortages of engineers and computer scientists requires a more precise understanding of dynamic industry needs and of the abilities of departments to address them. Finally, the inclusion of persons from groups underrepresented in most disciplines of engineering and computer science has remained a stubborn, longstanding issue, especially in electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, computer engineering, and computer science.

Therefore, NSF is taking a holistic look at how engineers and computer scientists are being prepared for lifelong careers in technical and socio-technical professions. It seeks to respond to the perennial call from different stakeholders (e.g., industry, the public, government, and the profession itself) for professional formation of engineers and computer scientists with a broad set of professional abilities. It seeks to address the fact that the percentages of persons from underrepresented groups entering into - and remaining in - the practice of engineering and computer science are still unacceptably low, impacting the future health of the national workforce.

To address these and related matters, in 2014, ENG launched an initiative, the *Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE)*, to create and support an innovative and inclusive engineering profession for the 21st century. The engineering and computer science professions must be responsive to national priorities, grand challenges, and dynamic workforce needs, and they must be equally open and available to all. The RED program was first offered in FY 2015 as a PFE initiative aligned with the IUSE framework. The RED program is a cross-directorate program, as multiple directorates at NSF support formation of engineers and computer scientists and institutional transformation as part of their overall strategies.

The importance of the undergraduate experience for preparing both a diverse STEM workforce equipped for innovation and a STEM literate public ready to support and benefit from the progress of science is described in a number of key reports and documents [e.g., *Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Revisited* (National Research Council, 2010); *Expanding Underrepresented Minority Participation* (National Research Council, 2011); *Engage to Excel* (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 2012); *Discipline-based Education Research* (National Research Council, 2012); *Federal Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education 5-Year Strategic Plan* (National Science and Technology Council, Committee on STEM Education, 2013)].

Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) is NSF's comprehensive, Foundation-wide framework for an integrated vision of the agency's investments in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education. The key guiding

principle of IUSE is to ensure focused, strategic investments that address the greatest challenges in U.S. undergraduate STEM education. The long-term goals of the IUSE framework are to: 1) improve STEM learning and learning environments, 2) broaden participation and institutional capacity for STEM learning, and 3) build the professional STEM workforce for tomorrow. Collectively, IUSE programs will 1) build core knowledge, 2) implement and scale evidence-based practices, 3) catalyze departmental and institutional transformation, 4) provide scholarships, and 5) promote disciplinary research experiences. NSF expects that investments within the IUSE portfolio will be informed by theories and findings from education research with attention to the needs and directions of frontier science and engineering research. New knowledge about both learning and implementation will be developed across all IUSE investments through a vibrant partnership of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and education experts.

In FY 2017, IUSE will

- Expand the emphasis on bringing evidence-based practices to scale for both the general improvement of STEM learning, and also to expand effective discipline-specific innovations;
- Focus on strategies for engaging undergraduates in their first two years in authentic research experiences both in courses and in other settings; and
- Emphasize broadening participation and workforce development in computer science, engineering, and geosciences.

[1] See the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying, Professional Engineers exam, <http://ncees.org/engineering/pe/>

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. Professional Formation

The complex problems facing society in the 21st century demand changes to the way engineers and computer scientists are educated. For example, solving the NAE Grand Challenges will require computer scientists and engineers who not only have deep technical knowledge, but also an understanding of the societal and global contexts in which those problems occur. Among the common challenges facing engineering and computer science departments are how to weave both technical and professional skills throughout the curriculum, including skills defined by the ABET outcomes; how to promote and incentivize faculty engagement in the change process; and how to create cultures of inclusion that are welcoming to students and faculty of all types. Revolutionary change is needed in the structure of departments and the way students are educated to meet these challenges.

Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE) and the Pledge of the Computing Professional [2] refer to the formal and informal processes and value systems through which people become engineers and computer scientists respectively. They include the ethical responsibility of practicing engineers and computer scientists to sustain and grow the profession in order to improve quality of life for all people. Professional formation includes, but is not limited to:

- Introductions to the profession at any age;
- Acquisition of deep technical and professional skills, knowledge, and abilities in both formal and informal settings/domains;
- Development of outlooks, perspectives, ways of thinking, knowing, and doing;
- Development of identity as a responsibly technical professional; and
- Acculturation to the profession, its standards, and norms.

Professional formation occurs within a complex ecosystem that includes formal classrooms; informal settings such as Maker spaces (hands-on, do-it-yourself environments where community members gather to create, invent, and learn [3]); industry settings (including co-op and internship experiences); as well as early career work, research experiences, mentor/mentee relationships, and sponsor/beneficiary relationships, etc. To facilitate such activities, engineers and computer scientists must understand and navigate this ecosystem for successful professional formation and practice. They must oversee and participate in developing and maintaining this ecosystem, with smooth and clear pathways to and through the profession. Pathways may include formal and informal education, apprenticeship (in some states), credentialing, and licensure.

NSF is committed to enabling a vibrant technical workforce for the 21st century. To that end, the current ecosystem must be studied and understood. Gaps and barriers to the formation of professional computer scientists and engineers must be identified, and weak “target points” in the pathways through the profession must be strengthened or eliminated. A “target point” is a vulnerable transition, or perhaps even an undesirable climate, that can adversely affect students’ progress along the path. Example “target points” include the typical transitions from high school into a two-year or four-year engineering or computer science degree program; from two-year to four-year institutions; from a BS degree to industry or graduate school; or from a BS or graduate degree to professional licensure [4]. A “target point” also may reflect a formal or informal setting composed of individuals of different backgrounds with little or no guidance on how to interact, or it may reflect narrow conceptions of what engineering is or should be that create strict and non-porous boundaries for the profession.

One of the “target points” to successful professional formation is the middle two years of the four year undergraduate experience for computer science and engineering students. It is during the middle two years where students receive the bulk of their formal technical preparation [5]. These middle years are also a critical transition point for transfer students from community colleges. It is a primary attrition point for engineering and computer science majors. During the middle two years, students often find themselves without the context to grasp the big picture surrounding technically focused courses that are widely perceived as “real”. Moreover, many professional skills - those that define what a technical professional is and does in the workforce - are emphasized in the first year but deemphasized or dropped entirely in the middle two years, only to be picked up again in upper level electives or capstone design experiences. These gaps in the middle years often contribute to confusion and frustration among students. They also have disproportionately negative effects on students for whom both the pathway and the professional destination are brand new experiences for them and their families. The innovations that have been adopted in the first and last year need to be expanded to and integrated with the middle two years. Teams are encouraged to consider the entire curriculum holistically as they focus on the middle years.

In addition to the target point of the middle years that computer science departments share with engineering, computer science enrollments are burgeoning across the Nation, as a result of growing interest in the field and the increasingly important role that advances in computing are playing in all areas of science, engineering, education, and society. For example, there is growing support for “CS+X” approaches that acknowledge the intersection of computer science and other disciplines, including the humanities. In an era of social-entrepreneurship and constantly evolving complex socio-technical challenges, computer science education is moving to better equip students to be successful in this new world. The inescapable technical rigor of the middle years courses does not have to be isolated from the social context and broader inter- and multidisciplinary opportunities that are drawing so many students to the field.

Hence, there is a need to build research capacity to better understand the complexity of the engineering and computer science education ecosystems and how to optimize them. There is a need to understand required change processes in these ecosystems, and once understood, to clearly articulate and implement these change processes. Finally, there is a need to increase welcome and access for groups underrepresented in engineering and computer science practice.

B. Revolutionizing Engineering and Computer Science Departments

Prior engineering and computer science education research has led to successes in the introductory and capstone years. However, little research has been done to bridge the innovations in introductory and capstone level engineering and computer science education across the entire undergraduate experience, including extracurricular professional activities and student transitions in and out of the program. Furthermore, prior research has also revealed the need for faculty development, faculty reward systems, and academic cultures that encourage engagement of faculty and students of diverse backgrounds in the full undergraduate-level formation process.

Thus, the goal of REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments (RED) is to address the stated challenges and develop well-functioning departments through faculty development, structural change, and cultural change, with a focus on student success in their professional formation attainment. While the RED program has a focus on the middle two years, approaches should consider the curriculum holistically. Specific activities supported by the RED solicitation may include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing convergent technical and professional threads that must be woven across the four years, especially in core technical courses of the middle two years, in internship opportunities in the private and public sectors, and in research opportunities with faculty;
- Exploring strategies for institutional, systemic, and cultural change, including new approaches to faculty governance or department structures and to restructuring faculty incentive or reward systems;
- Exploring collaborative arrangements with industry and other stakeholders who are mutually interested in developing the best possible professional formation environments and opportunities for students;
- Exploring strategies to bridge the engineering and computer science education research-to-practice gap, primarily through faculty development and adoption of best practices in the professional formation of engineers and computer scientists; and
- Exploring revolutionary means of recruiting and retaining students and faculty reflective of the modern and swiftly changing demographics of the United States.

All these, and other, activities must focus on how to make change adaptable to other departments and institutions and how they impact students of different backgrounds who are navigating the varied pathways through the undergraduate professional formation process. NSF will conduct a site visit at the end of year 3 of the grant to assess progress towards meeting the goals of the project.

C. Key Features of RED

For the RED solicitation, proposed efforts for departmental change should be revolutionary, not incrementally reformist, and strategies should be developed with impact on the student as the focus. Revolutionary means radically, suddenly, or completely new; producing fundamental, structural change; or going outside of or beyond existing norms and principles. Proposed efforts must be grounded in sound educational theory and work to enable a continuous progression of professional formation through the four year experience. Efforts should address 21st-century and T-shaped skills (i.e., cross-disciplinary breadth), and they should be aligned with stakeholder expectations.

The intent of this solicitation is to focus on significant, systemic departmental change as it impacts student success in their professional formation. Proposals should reflect:

- A clear demonstration of the PI, i.e., the chair/head (or equivalent), as an innovative leader of systemic change in the department to achieve the stated goals of the RED activities.
- An understanding that agents of change come in all forms (faculty, students, staff, administrators, other program partners) and all should be empowered as actors of transformative change.
- An understanding of the role of each of the RED team members in creating change, demonstrating clear and significant contributions from the department head or dean, the engineering or computer science education expert, and the social scientist attuned to departmental dynamics.
- An understanding of the research on how students of diverse backgrounds learn engineering or computer science and what has been previously attempted.
- An understanding of how engineering or computer science education research connects to practice and of barriers to faculty adoption of engineering or computer science education innovations.
- An appreciation that faculty participation, engagement, development, and belief in the scholarship of learning are critical to success.
- An understanding of department organizational and cultural changes needed to create and sustain change.
- An appreciation that curricular and pedagogical changes are not sufficient, and that structural changes are needed in the department's practices to enact change.
- An understanding of the importance of linking to professional practice through involvement of the department's or college's existing Industrial Advisory Board (or equivalent);
- An acknowledgement of additional example strategies, such as increasing the stature of professor(s) of practice and their role as change agents or connecting the work with professional masters programs.
- A research component that has the potential to inform the academic community more broadly regarding important factors that lead to institutional change.
- An incorporation of sustainability, adaptability, and scalability considerations. Often, successful innovations in engineering and computer science education do not spread much beyond their origin. This problem can be seen in large variations in retention, diversity, and preparation across departments and institutions. Sustainability, adaptability, and scalability are three fundamental characteristics that are necessary for local innovations to have large-scale impacts. It is therefore critical that proposed approaches incorporate sustainability, adaptability, and scalability by design. Scaling should occur both within the department's institution and to other institutions. In addition, it would be important to adapt best practices and strategies from scaling of social innovations, leverage potential power of social and professional networking tools, and synergistic connections with stakeholder networks such as ASEE, NSBE, SWE, SHPE, ASME, IEEE, NCTM, NCWIT, iAAMCS, ACM, CRA, and other organizations. Successful proposals would include creative strategies that maximize the probability of scaling and adaptation for large scale national impacts.

[2] <http://pledge-of-the-computing-professional.org>

[3] <http://oedb.org/librarian/a-librarians-guide-to-makerspaces>

[4] For a review of the literature on target points see Sheppard, S.D., Antonio, A.L., Brunhaver, S.R., and Gilmmartin, S.K. "Studying the Career Pathways of Engineers," *Cambridge Handbook of Engineering Education Research*, Johri and Olds, eds. New York:

Cambridge University Press, 2014; and Jamieson, L., and Lohman, J. (2012). *Innovation with Impact: Creating a Culture for Scholarly and Systematic Innovation in Engineering Education*. Washington, DC: American Society for Engineering Education.

[5] For a review of the literature on the middle two years, see Lord, S.M. and Chen, J.C. "Curriculum Design in the Middle Years," *Cambridge Handbook of Engineering Education Research*, Johri and Olds, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

III. AWARD INFORMATION

Six to eight awards will be made, each in an amount from \$1,000,000 to \$2,000,000 total for a duration of up to 5 years. Estimated program budget and number of awards are subject to the availability of funds and the quality of proposals received.

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Universities and Colleges - Universities and two- and four-year colleges (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in, the US acting on behalf of their faculty members. Such organizations also are referred to as academic institutions.

Who May Serve as PI:

The Principal Investigator must be a department chair/head (or equivalent) to establish institutional accountability. There must be a RED team that includes (at a minimum) an expert in engineering education or computer science education research who can ground the research plan in the literature, and a social science expert who can advise on strategies for developing a culture of change and on strategies for creating meaningful collective ownership of the effort among faculty, students, and staff. The social scientist must have the expertise to evaluate departmental dynamics and monitor change processes.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

2

An organization is allowed up to two submissions per competition.

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

1

An individual may serve as PI or co-PI on only one submission per competition.

Additional Eligibility Info:

Only colleges and universities with baccalaureate engineering and/or computer science programs located and accredited in the U.S. are eligible to apply. However, partnerships are encouraged with local two year colleges (including community colleges), to ensure that the impacts of departmental changes on two-year colleges (and especially the two-to-four year pathway through engineering and/or computer science) are properly considered.

Institutions that have previously received a RED award are not eligible to receive an award under this solicitation.

Institutions may only receive one award under this solicitation.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Letters of Intent (required):

A one-page Letter of Intent is required to be submitted by the lead institution for each proposal. Letters of Intent are not reviewed. They are used to gauge the submission of proposals and the review requirements. No feedback will be given.

The format of the letter is as follows:

Institution:

Engineering or Computer Science Department:

PI (Dept. Head/Chair or equivalent), with contact information:

RED team members and their roles:

Partners/Collaborators:

Project Title: The title should begin with "IUSE/PFE:RED:"

Synopsis (200-word limit): Provide a brief summary of the vision for the department, goals of the proposed RED project, and preliminary plans for sustainability after NSF funding.

Letter of Intent Preparation Instructions:

When submitting a Letter of Intent through FastLane in response to this Program Solicitation please note the conditions outlined below:

- Submission by an Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) is not required when submitting Letters of Intent.
- A Minimum of 0 and Maximum of 4 Other Senior Project Personnel are allowed
- Submission of multiple Letters of Intent is not allowed

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

- 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=papp. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 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 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: (http://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) 292-7827 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.

Full Proposal Contents

This program solicitation contains supplemental instructions to the Grant Proposal Guide (GPG) and NSF Grants.gov Application Guide. All standard sections of the proposal are required. The following instructions supplement the guidelines in the GPG and NSF Grants.gov Application Guide for the specified sections.

The proposal should include the following information in the project description:

Vision for Revolutionizing the Engineering or Computer Science Department – Describe the department and the student professional formation experience “after the revolution”. How is success defined? Provide a concise answer to the question, “What will be different?”

Project Plan and evaluation framework – Informed by the department’s vision for revolution, provide:

- Goals: What outcomes at the end of this project will move the department toward the vision? What will change about the department? What will change about the faculty? What will change about the professional formation of students? What will change nationally? Who will be impacted?
- Objectives: What specific targets will impact achieving the stated goals? For example, if a goal is a faculty both well-equipped and enthusiastic to engage best practices in professional formation, what incentives are intended to be provided?
- Specific Actions: How will objectives be accomplished? For example, what will the process be for changing the faculty development incentive system? What is the **theory of change**; that is, substantiate how and why should these activities effect lasting change? How will the impacts of the activities be measured? How will the efforts be sustained in the long term, especially if there are changes in department leadership over time? Explain who will be responsible for which elements of the project. Be sure to describe what has been attempted previously in the literature in order to justify that the proposed innovations of the RED activities have not been attempted elsewhere.
- Research Plan: What will this project add to the knowledge base about creating change at the department level in engineering or computer science? What are the research questions you seek to answer? What educational or sociological theories speak to your research questions and the methodologies one might use to shape appropriate methods to answer the research questions posed? How will the achievement of the objectives and goals be measured? These measures can be qualitative or quantitative as appropriate to the question and theoretical orientation.
- Barriers: What are the anticipated barriers in carrying out the project plans and achieving the specific objectives? What are the anticipated barriers to connecting research to practice? What contingency plans are in place to address these barriers?
- External Advisory Board (Required): How will an external advisory board (for the department or college) be used to advance the proposed plan? Who will be included and why, and how will they contribute to the project?
- Evaluation Plan: Based on the theory of change and the desirable outcomes of the proposed revolution, enumerate appropriate indicators of success related to accomplishing the goals and objectives and a timeframe to seek measurable change.
- Mentoring Plans: Explain how faculty will be mentored over the course of this project and by whom; what faculty development opportunities will be provided; and how faculty will be incentivized. Explain how graduate and undergraduate students will be involved in the project and how they will be mentored as part of the proposed departmental vision for revolution.

Roadmap for Adaption and Scaling: How will the new knowledge generated about departmental change be received and adapted by others? (This effort must go beyond traditional "dissemination" and include considerations of adaptability and scalability to achieve larger scale impacts.) How will partnerships be built and used to extend the work of this project to others? Specifically, how will the knowledge gains and broader impacts be disseminated and shared within the institution and beyond the institution? How will the successes and failures be embraced as opportunities for growth and shared widely? What mechanisms will be used to offer wide and deep reach to other departments, programs, organizations, etc?

Supplementary Documentation:

Institutional Information – Provide full descriptive demographics for your institution and department(s) in a supplemental document not to exceed two pages.

- Describe the undergraduate, graduate, and faculty populations. This should include information about race/ethnicity, gender, disabilities, and academic level or rank, if possible.
- Provide current retention data for undergraduates (separately for both first-time-full-time first-year and transfer students) and how these data were calculated. Of particular interest are the 2nd to 3rd year retention rate and the 5-year graduation rate. This information should include racial/ethnic, gender, and persons with disabilities breakdowns, if possible.
- Provide an overview of department instructional activities including who teaches the courses, labs, and recitation sections; the faculty teaching load; and class sizes.
- Describe current department processes, policies, and roles related to faculty development, professional formation of students, and department governance.
- Describe the department's prior efforts in enhancing teaching and learning practices or in department level reform of engineering or computer science education, including strengths and weaknesses and areas targeted for improvement.

Scan the signed original(s) of the following document(s) and upload the scans as a PDF file into the Supplementary Documents section of the proposal. Do not send paper copies to NSF. All documents must be submitted with the proposal in FastLane or Grants.gov by the deadline.

Letter(s) from Institutional Leadership – Provide letters from the Dean, Provost, and/or President (as appropriate for your project) to ensure support and feasibility in the short and long term. The letter(s) should be no more than 2 pages in length, and it must include the individual's name and title below the signature.

Letter(s) from Other Partners– Provide letters of collaboration from other partners as appropriate. The letter(s) should be no more than 1 page in length, and should include a clear description of how the partner will participate in the project. General letters of endorsement are not allowed.

Only the items listed above, the Data Management Plan, and the Postdoctoral Research Mentoring Plan (if applicable) may be included as Supplementary Documents. Any additional information needed to evaluate the proposal must be part of the Project Description.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:

Proposal budgets must be between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 total for a duration of up to 5 years. Proposals that fall outside of these limits will be returned without review.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

A Budget Justification prepared in accordance with the guidance in the GPG must be included. PI Meeting Attendance: Include travel funds in the budget for (required) team attendance at a yearly PI meeting at NSF.

C. Due Dates

- **Letter of Intent Due Date(s) (required)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

December 09, 2016

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

January 18, 2017

D. FastLane/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via FastLane:

To prepare and submit a proposal via FastLane, see detailed technical instructions available at: <https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov/a1/newstan.htm>. For FastLane user support, call the FastLane Help Desk at 1-800-673-6188 or e-mail fastlane@nsf.gov. The FastLane Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the FastLane system. 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: <http://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 are strongly encouraged to use FastLane 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: http://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 *Investing in Science, Engineering, and Education for the Nation's Future: NSF Strategic Plan for 2014-2018*. 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

- **Vision:** How revolutionary is the vision in light of a well-grounded understanding of the history, context, and culture of the department? Revolutionary means radically, suddenly, or completely new; producing fundamental, structural change; or going outside of or beyond existing norms and principles.
- **PI Team:** Is the RED team complete, with all required expertise? Is each member fully qualified to perform the proposed work?
- **Institutional Commitment:** Do the letter(s) of commitment provide evidence of support for the project sufficient to achieve the goals and objectives?
- **Connection to Professional Practice:** Is there a sufficient connection in the proposed project to professional practice? For example, what is the extent of involvement of the industrial advisory board, and how has the department involved professors of practice, a professional master's program, or other elements that bridge the gap between engineering or computer science education and practice?
- **Faculty Development Plan:** Is faculty development well planned and properly incentivized to build department cultures that support the holistic professional formation of engineers or computer scientists?
- **Potential for Success and Sustainability:** How achievable and significant are the proposed changes in the middle two years of the technical core? Is the theory of change valid and well justified? How responsive are the changes to the call to focus on professional skills? Reviewers will take into account justification of the research plan using the literature, comprehensiveness of the plan, institutional leadership commitments, sustainability of change (including leadership changes and financial sustainability), and the propagation roadmap/transferability of change strategies.
- **Connection to Research on Engineering and Computer Science Education:** How well-informed are the vision and execution plan by the literature and prior attempts, if applicable, to implement change? Is the expectation of success well-justified?
- **Adaptation and Scaling:** How likely is the new knowledge generated about how to change department culture to be received and utilized by others? How well-conceived are the plans for accomplishing this goal?

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by Ad hoc Review and/or Panel Review.

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 http://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 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=papp.

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=papp.

Additional Reporting

As part of the annual report, PIs should include updated institutional profile data as requested in this solicitation. PIs should also include discussion of department dynamics and obstacles or progress in establishing a culture supportive of holistic professional formation of engineers and/or computer scientists.

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:

- Kamau Bobb, Program Director, Division of Computer and Network Systems, Directorate for Computer & Information Science & Engineering, telephone: (703) 292-4291, email: kbobb@nsf.gov
- Elliot Douglas, Program Director, Division of Engineering Education and Centers, Directorate for Engineering, telephone: (703) 292-7051, email: edouglas@nsf.gov
- Olga Pierrakos, Program Director, Division of Undergraduate Education, Directorate for Education and Human Resources, telephone: (703) 292-7936, email: olpierra@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact:

- FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1-800-673-6188; e-mail: fastlane@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 <http://www.grants.gov>.

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 <http://www.nsf.gov>

- **Location:** 4201 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22230
- **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 Systems of Records, [NSF-50](#), "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004), and [NSF-51](#), "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004). 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
Arlington, VA 22230

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



The National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22230, USA
Tel: (703) 292-5111, FIRS: (800) 877-8339 | TDD: (800) 281-8749

[Text Only](#)