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National Science Foundation
Thank You for Participating

Expected Outcomes for Today’s Workshop Include:

• Provide participants with a deeper understanding of NSF and Noyce program policies and procedures related to proposal development and management.

• Provide participants with a clearer vision of Noyce program tracks and requirements.

• Build viable Noyce and STEM education networks among MSIs.

• Solicit submission of Noyce proposals to the August 2019 Noyce program deadline.
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NSF Policy & Compliance Essentials
Considerations before proposal submission

Noyce Program Officers
Karen Keene
Sandra Richardson (Noyce Program Lead)
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Navigating a Multi-level Process

• Start with the PAPPG.
  • Federal policies and guidelines
  • Institutional policies and practices

• Be familiar with the NSF Merit Review Process and Program Solicitation.

• Talk with the Sponsored Research Office (or comparable office) at your institution.

• Identify cognizant Program Officers.
What is the Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG)?

The PAPPG contains documents relating to NSF’s proposal and award process. It has been designed for use by both our customer community and NSF staff and consists of two parts.

- Part I is NSF’s proposal preparation and submission guidelines.
- Part II is NSF’s award and administration guidelines.

The PAPPG is updated each year. Always use the most current version.
Proposal Preparation and Submission Guidelines
(unless modified by guidelines in solicitations and program announcements)

FastLane

The policy and procedural guidance contained in Part I of the PAPPG relates specifically to proposals submitted via the NSF FastLane System. FastLane may be used for proposal preparation, submission, file updates, and select post-award administrative activities. See the FastLane website at:
https://www.fastlane.nsf.gov

Grants.gov

The policy and procedural guidance contained in the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide relates specifically to proposals submitted via Grants.gov. Grants.gov was established as a government-wide resource to electronically find grant opportunities, as well as to apply for Federal awards. Grants.gov is a central storehouse for information on over 1,000 grant programs from the 26 Federal grant-making agencies and provides access to approximately $550 billion annually in awards.
http://www.grants.gov
PAPPG vs. Noyce Solicitation

- Current Noyce solicitation is NSF 17-541.

- Solicitation guidance takes precedence over the NSF PAPPG.
Required Components for Noyce Submissions

- Cover Sheet

- Project Summary
  - Merit Review: Intellectual Merit (IM) and Broader Impact Sections (BI)

- Project Description
  - Results from Prior NSF Support (including IM and BI)
  - 15 pg max (encourage use of all 15 pages)

- References Cited

- Biographical Sketches (2 pg max)

- Budget and Budget Justification
  (NSF Session #3 this afternoon)

- Current and Pending Support

- Facilities, Equipment and other Resources

- Supplemental Documentation
  - Data Management Plan
  - Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan
  - Collaboration Letters

- Single Copy Documents
  - Collaborators and Other Affiliations Information
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Activity 1: Scavenger Hunt

- The objective of this activity is to practice locating guidance on complex questions via the PAPPG and/or Noyce solicitation.

Where in the PAPPG or Noyce solicitation do you find answers to these questions?

1. Are letters of support allowable for proposal submissions?
2. Can additional documents (e.g., degree plans) be added as an appendix to a submission?
3. Are supplemental documents allowable? If yes, is what types of included documents are allowable for Noyce submissions?
4. Can my proposal be returned without the benefit of a review? If yes, in what cases will this happen?
5. Can I use font size 10 in a proposal submission?
Merit Review Principles

Merit Review Principles are to be given due diligence by:

- Principal Investigators and organizations when preparing proposals and managing projects;

- Reviewers when reading and evaluating proposals; and

- NSF program staff when determining whether or not to recommend proposals for funding and while overseeing awards.
Merit Review Criteria

Developed by the National Science Board, the policymaking arm of the Foundation:

• **Intellectual Merit**: The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge;

• **Broader Impacts**: The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.
5 Elements of NSF Merit Review Criteria

The following elements should be considered in the review for **both Intellectual Merit & Broader Impacts:**

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 institution to conduct the proposed activities?

5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home institution or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?
Broader Impacts Unpacked

Broader Impact 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;
• development of a diverse, globally competitive STEM workforce;
• increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others;
• increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; and
• enhanced infrastructure for research and education.
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Feedback from Merit Review

- Summary of panel discussion (if applicable)
- Reviewer ratings (such as: E, V, G, F, P)
- Analysis of how well proposal addressed both review criteria
- Proposal strengths and weaknesses
- PO Comments with reasons for a declination (if applicable)

If you have any questions, contact a cognizant Program Officer.
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Activity 2: NSF Merit Review Criteria

Review the Noyce program solicitation and one-page summary of the project that your team submitted to QEM. Answer the following questions to improve the extent to which your project concept addresses the NSF merit review criteria. As you work your way through each question, if the answer is not readily apparent in your one-page description, at some point today, discuss with your team how to revise your one-pager so the answer to each question becomes clear in your write-up.

1. What is the national significance or compelling issue being addressed?
2. What is “the it” or the focus of your plan and/or project activities?
3. What are the intended outcomes of the project? How will your plan lead to these outcomes? How will success be evaluated?
4. On what previous research or prior personal work are you building on? How does it relate to the project?
5. What expertise is needed on the project team?
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Additional Conversation or Questions?