|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Investigator** | Dr. Renanah M. Joyce, Assistant Professor of Politics | **Institution** | Brandeis University |
| **Funding program** | [Security and Preparedness (SAP)](https://new.nsf.gov/funding/opportunities/security-preparedness-sap) | **Deadline** | 1/15/2024 |
| **Review date** | 12/29/2024 |  |  |

**Summary**

The proposed collaborative project explores military access for power projection from a holistic perspective focusing on perceptions of soft power-building efforts. Shifting the focus away from a traditional military-basing framework of overseas power projection to less-explored methods of building goodwill and support for hosting a foreign military presence has great potential for scholarly knowledge generation and benefits to society if leveraged for policy making. Greater attention to cohesion, plan detail, and justifying methods would strengthen the case for support for this effort.

**Strengths**

* The multi-campus team collectively possesses impressive credentials, a strong history of related research, grant project management experience, relevant quantitative and qualitative methodology expertise, and access to government networks.
* The proposal is well-aligned to the NSF SAP program’s interests.
* The research proposed can contribute to filling gaps in how great power competition shapes the domestic foundations of support for basing and contribute to understanding of military bases and access as an outcome of interest.
* The proposed project has critical implications for US national security policymakers as well as policymakers in base host countries.

**Weaknesses**

* The statement of work is not fully clear or consistent. Most notably the Project Summary includes four countries in the study over three years while the project description asserts two or three countries being studied with all deliverables to be completed in only one year.
* The methodology lacks important details including the sampling strategy, instrument specifications, experiment prompt explanation, interview analysis, and the logistics of access and anticipated response rates in countries of interest.
* The alignment between the anticipated broader impacts and the research questions/hypotheses and data collection/analysis plan is spotty.
* The broader impacts for students, the research assistant, and dissemination would benefit from specificity.
* A “Prior NSF Support” section is missing.
* Clearly defining terms (such as “elite”) and reorganizing some of the sections would ease clarity of the order of information presented for the reviewers.
* Presenting relevant historical background related to basing and power projection in the countries of interest would be helpful.
* It seems like the overarching questions of interest would be best able to be answered with longitudinal studies (ideally with baselines before power plays). Would it be helpful to couch the proposed effort within a larger plan?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Summary** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Does not exceed one page | Met | One page. |
| Uses one of the following fonts identified below:   * Arial (not Arial Narrow), Courier New, or Palatino Linotype at a font size of 10 points or larger; * Times New Roman at a font size of 11 points or larger; or Computer Modern family of fonts at a font size of 11 points or larger.   No more than six lines of text within a vertical space of one inch | Met | Times New Roman at a font size of 11 points. |
| Consists of an Overview, statement of Intellectual Merit and a statement of the Broader Impacts of the proposed activity in separate labeled paragraphs, with each heading on its own line | Met | Appropriate. |
| The overview includes a brief description of the overarching goal(s) of the proposal. | Mostly Met | More explicitly state the purpose and describe the field work. |
| The statement of intellectual merit describes the potential to advance research capacity, scholarship, and knowledge. | Mostly Met | Emphasize how the proposed research is novel/transformative in terms of knowledge generation for the fields involved. |
| The statement of broader impacts describes the potential of the proposed activity to benefit society. | Partially Met | Go further to specify the benefits to society. |
| Is written in third person. | Unmet | Use the third person throughout. |
|  |  |  |
| **Project Title** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| If the submission is a collaborative proposal from multiple organizations, the project title must begin with the words "Collaborative Research:” If  funded, each organization bears responsibility for a separate award. | Unmet | This project appears to be structured as collaborative research. If so, add the preface "Collaborative Research:” to the title. |
|  |  |  |
| **Project Description** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| **FORMATTING** | | |
| Does not exceed the 15 single-spaced page limit. | Met | Currently, 10.5 pages, leaving room for 4.5 more pages for additional detail. |
| Uses one of the following fonts identified below:   * Arial (not Arial Narrow), Courier New, or Palatino Linotype at a font size of 10 points or larger; * Times New Roman at a font size of 11 points or larger; or Computer Modern family of fonts at a font size of 11 points or larger.   No more than six lines of text within a vertical space of one inch | Met | Times New Roman at a font size of 11 points. |
| Does not include page numbers | Unmet | Remove page numbers. Do not include page numbers on any documents, as they will all be compiled into one long PDF upon upload to Research.gov. |
| Margins, in all directions, must be at least an inch. | Met | Margins, in all directions, are an inch. |
| Does not contain URLs. | Met | Does not contain URLs. |
| **CONTENT – PAPPG General:** | | |
| Provides a clear statement of the work to be undertaken. | Unmet | The statement of work is not fully clear or consistent. See comments in the Project Description. |
| Includes the objectives for the period of the proposed work. | Partially Met | While deliverables are clearly specified and research questions are included, there are not clear objectives. |
| Includes the expected significance. | Mostly Met | The proposed work is of great significance to national interests. See questions in the document regarding the degree of alignment between the broader impacts expected and the methods employed. |
| The Project Description outlines the general plan of work, including the broad design of activities to  be undertaken, and, where appropriate, provides a clear description of experimental methods and  procedures. | Partially Met | The specific activities and experimental methods and procedures require more details. |
| Proposers address what they 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. | Partially Met | See above. In addition to making the “how” clearer and the benefits aligned, consider adding how you will know if you succeed. |
| The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified. | Partially Met | While it appears the team has deep, relevant experience, important aspects of the activities and methods seem to be taken for granted and would benefit from explicitly making a well-justified case. |
| **Broader Impacts:** | | |
| The Project Description contains, as a separate section within the narrative, a section  labeled “Broader Impacts”. | Met | Included. |
| Provides compelling broader impacts of the proposed activities. (Proposers may consult the National Alliance for Broader Impacts (NABI) [Guiding](https://engagementscholarship.org/upload/resources/nabi_guiding_principles-1.pdf)  [Principles and Questions for National Science Foundation Proposals](https://engagementscholarship.org/upload/resources/nabi_guiding_principles-1.pdf).) 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. | Partially Met | The potential impacts for U.S. national security policymakers are significant. The broader impacts for students, the research assistant, and dissemination would benefit from specificity. |
| **Results from Prior NSF Support** | | |
| Includes a results from Prior NSF Support section. | Unmet | A “Prior NSF Support” section is missing. If no co-PIs have received NSF support within the past 5 years, the section must still be included and state no prior support, per the PAPPG. If support has been received, the required information must be included. |
| **(if applicable):** Describes intellectual merit and broader impacts of prior NSF funding with research components (if any). (See PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.d.iii for guidance. If any PI or co-PI identified on the proposal has received prior NSF support including:  • an award with an end date in the past five years; or  • any current funding, including any no cost extensions,  information on the award is required for each PI and co-PI, regardless of whether the support was directly  related to the proposal or not. In cases where the PI or any co-PI has received more than one award  they need only report on the one award that is most closely related to the proposal. ) | - | - |
| Provides the title of award, NSF award number, amount, and period of support. | - | - |
| Provides a summary of results, described separately under two distinct headings: intellectual merit and broader impacts. | - | - |
| Lists publications and products resulting from the award (can be included in References Cited). | - | - |
| Support from NSF as well as other agencies and foundations should be listed in the Current and Pending (Other) Support section. For non-NSF awards and support, the PI should very briefly explain in the project description, the purpose of any listed awards and their role in the project. |  | Ensure inclusion in the Current and Pending Support. |
| **CONTENT – Security and Preparedness-Specific Focus** | | |
| Aligns with SAP’s support of basic scientific research that advances knowledge and understanding of issues broadly related to global and national security, including international conflict and dispute resolution, domestic political instability and civil war, and the security implications of climate change. Substantive areas include (but are not limited to) international relations, global and national security, human security, political violence, state stability, conflict processes, regime transition, international and comparative political economy, and peace science. | Met | The proposal is well-aligned to the NSF SAP program’s interests. |
| Proposed projects are expected to be:   * theoretically motivated, * conceptually precise, * methodologically rigorous, and * empirically oriented. | Partially Met | See comments in the document about adding details to the methodological rigor, concept, and theory. |
| The Program supports research experiences for undergraduate students and infrastructural activities, including methodological innovations. | Partially Met | The details around the research assistant and opportunities for diverse student bodies are missing. |
| The Program does not fund applied research. | Met | Appropriate. |
| Applicants are encouraged to examine the websites for the National Science Foundation's Accountable Institutions and Behavior (AIB) and Law and Science (LS) programs. | Resource | Resources available. |
| **GENERAL REVIEW CRITERIA** | | |
| Intellectual Merit: Holds strong potential for the proposed activity to advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields | Mostly Met | Some places in the narrative make a compelling case for how the proposed works fills gaps and connects lines of research that have historically been siloed. Other places would benefit from a clearer argument. |
| Broader Impacts: Holds strong potential for the proposed activity to benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes. | Mostly Met | The potential benefits are great and of consequence at an international scale. Articulation of benefits and alignment with the limitations of methods proposed could be improved. |
| (Both IM and BI): To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts? | Partially Met | Please see the comments in previous rubric sections and in the Project Description document. |
| (Both IM and BI): 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? | Partially Met | Please see the comments in previous rubric sections and in the Project Description document. |
| (Both IM and BI): How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities? | Met |  |
| (Both IM and BI): Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities? | Partially Met | The FEOR (not included for review) should articulate the resources and make a case for adequacy. Connections and collaborations are eluded to in the management section but not detailed or evidenced. |

**Attachments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **References Cited** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Each reference must include the names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Biographical Sketches** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Biosketches provided for PI, Co-PIs and other Senior Personnel. |  |  |
| All Bio-sketches follow the [NSF-approved forma](https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/biosketch.jsp)t (see [PAPPG II.C.2.f](https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappg22_1/pappg_2.jsp#IIC2f)) through SciENcv. |  |  |
| Does not exceed three pages for each personnel. |  |  |
| Provides professional preparation (institution, location, major, degree, and year of degree) |  |  |
| Lists academic/professional appointments in reverse chronological order |  |  |
| Lists up to 10 products or publications and includes full citations |  |  |
| Lists up to five synergistic activities that demonstrate the broader impact of the individual’s professional/scholarly activities |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Collaborators and Other Affiliations** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Uses the new COA template: <https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/coa.jsp> |  |  |
| Provided for PI, Co-PIs and other Senior Personnel. |  |  |
| Contains complete information requested, per instructions. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Current and Pending Support** | | |
| Requirements | Met/Unmet | Comments |
| Uses the NSF-approved format for preparation of current and pending support through SciENcv.  <https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/cps.jsp> |  |  |
| Provided for PI, Co-PIs, senior personnel (including those for whom no funding is requested). |  |  |
| All investigators list the proposed project as pending support. |  |  |
| Contains complete information requested, per instructions. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget and Budget Justification** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Provide standard yearly and cumulative budget pages as described in the PAPPG. |  |  |
| Aligns with NSF cost categories and guidelines. |  |  |
| Budget justification explains each line item for which funds are requested. Major cost items or unusual situations are explained/justified in the budget justification. |  |  |
| Budget justification does not exceed five pages |  |  |
| Budget includes **zero** cost sharing. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| Describes resources that are directly applicable to the proposed project. |  |  |
| Includes an aggregated description of the internal and external resources (both physical and personnel) that the organization and its collaborators will provide to the project, should it be funded. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Management Plan** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| No more than 2 pages, labeled Data Management Plan. |  |  |
| * Describes the types of data (including metadata and annotations, primary or analyzed) and products that will be generated. |  |  |
| Data generated through any Broader Impact activities are included. |  |  |
| Describes the format and media in which the data or products are stored (e.g., hardcopy notebook and/or instrument outputs, ASCII, html, jpeg or other formats). |  |  |
| Describes plans, if any, for providing general access to data, including websites maintained by your research group, and direct contributions to public databases or software repositories. |  |  |
| Describes policies for data sharing including, where applicable, provisions for protection of privacy, confidentiality, intellectual property, national security, or other rights or requirements. |  |  |
| Describes, where applicable, policies regarding the use of data provided via general access or sharing. Practices for appropriate protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, and other rights are described. |  |  |
| Describes when the data should be archived, how data will be archived, and how preservation of access will be handled, including physical and cyber resources that will be used for data preservation. |  |  |
| States how long will the data be maintained after the grant period ends. |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Supplementary Documents** | | |
| **Requirements** | **Met/Unmet** | **Comments** |
| * **Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan** (if applicable) |  |  |
| **Letters of Collaboration** (if applicable)  Should be limited to a statement of the intent to collaborate and should not contain endorsements or evaluation of the proposed project.  Follows the single-sentence format:   * "If the proposal submitted by Dr. [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] entitled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by the NSF, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description/Research Plan or the Facilities, Equipment or Other Resources section of the proposal." |  |  |
| **Projects involving collaboration with foreign organizations and/or work in foreign countries:** As stated in the PAPPG, NSF rarely provides direct funding to support foreign organizations and only provides support for the U.S. portion of collaborative projects. If foreign organization involvement is essential to the project, subawards or consultant arrangements may be considered if the foreign organization contributes unique resources not otherwise available, or significant education, training and/or research opportunities to the U.S. Such information must be provided in the Project Description section of the proposal. For studies in countries other than the United States, the Project Description should discuss, where appropriate, collaborations with scientists and students from the host country, and how these  individuals will be involved in the project. Collaborations should be well justified, in that they represent true intellectual collaboration and utilize the expertise and specialized skills, facilities, and/or resources of the foreign collaborator. Letters of collaboration must be included in the Other Supplementary Documents section of the proposal. These letters should include a discussion of the role of the collaborator in the project and the resources the collaborating foreign institution/organization will provide to the project. Principal investigators are encouraged to provide U.S. students and junior researchers with international research experiences. Where relevant, arrangements to allocate samples and data between host country organization(s) or institution(s) and U.S. organization(s) or institution(s) should be discussed in the proposal. Investigators are encouraged to include any such permits (including legally required collecting, import, and export permits for samples, instrumentation, and data), authorizations, and agreements, in the Other Supplementary Documents section of the proposal. |  |  |
| Letters of support and other supplementary documents are not allowed. |  |  |