



EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement Program Track-1: (RII Track-1)

Sean Kennan

Program Director, NSF EPSCoR

PD/PA Meeting

22 May 2018

RII Track-1 No-cost extensions and Supplements

- RII Track-1 projects in last year with pending RII Track-1 proposal can request 6 month no-cost-extension
- Current RII Track-1 awards with no-cost extensions may be eligible for supplements
 - Reviewed by NSF EPSCoR on case-by-case basis
 - Unliquidated balance should be $\leq \$1M$
 - Requests should total $\leq \$1M$
- No more than 6 months overlap allowed for RII Track-1 projects

RII Track-1 External Evaluation

- External Evaluators participate in Strategic Planning; attend meeting
- Evaluation Plan developed by External Evaluator working with management team
- Evaluation Plan must be submitted to NSF prior to Annual Report due date
- Year 1 may be evaluated at any time after approval of Evaluation Plan; may be rolled into Year 2 evaluation
- Note that evaluation plans and reports should be delivered to PD/management team several months before due date



RII Track-1 Proposal Guidelines

- FY19 solicitation released (NSF 18-558)
https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=503429
- *Letter of Intent (LOI) required!!!!*
Due July 3, 2018
NSF internal planning only; not considered in merit review
 - *Use FastLane!*
- Full proposals due **July 31, 2018**
- Eligible if:
 - No current RII Track-1, or
 - Current RII Track-1 expires by October 1, 2019

RII Track-1 Important Items (budget)

- \$20M over 5 years
 - Not limited to \$4M/year
 - Budget request should reflect project effort/needs over time (Scope, Schedule, Budget)
 - Timely spending is required to justify continuing grant increments

Cost Sharing

- Show entire cost sharing amount (20%) on Line M of Year 1
- Budget justification: explain source, nature, amount, and availability
 - Cost sharing must be allowable and allocable to the project
 - sources and uses must be consistent with policies of NSF and the awardee institution(s) as well as federal and state (or territorial) laws and regulations
- Seed funding may not exceed 10% of NSF budget annually
 - Seed funding projects/activities funded through cost share must relate to the scope of the RII Track-1 project as defined by proposal and Strategic Plan.

Jurisdiction Science & Technology Plan

- Required Supplementary Documentation
- Must be accepted/approved at jurisdiction level
 - By steering committee or other governing official/body
 - Acceptance/approval indicated by signature(s) and date, either in S&T plan or in letter (Supp. Doc.)
- Effective date on cover page
- Approver cannot be a participant
- Avoid Return without Review – ensure S&T Plan is current and approved
- Identify STEM research priorities of jurisdiction
 - Alignment with research activities of proposal considered during merit review

Lists of Participants & Participating Organizations

Participants (and others)

- PIs and co-PIs (appear on the cover page)
- Other funded participants (appear in budget lines A or B)
- External Evaluator(s) named in proposal
- Consultants (other than external evaluators)
- Advisory Board (if known) and Steering Committee members
- Unfunded participants and collaborators (if named)

Organizations

- Primary awardee and Subawardees (budget under G.5)
- Subcontractors (budget under G.3 or G.6)
- Unfunded (collaborating organizations not receiving funding/payment):
- Providing support, facilities, internships, etc.

Collaborators and Other Affiliations (C&OA)

- NSF [*Proposal and Award Policies & Procedures Guide*](#) (PAPPG Chapter II.C.1.e) (NSF 18-1) requires PIs, co-PIs, and other senior project personnel to individually upload C&OA information as a Single Copy Document
- NSF requires submission of a spreadsheet template to identify C&OA
 - directly linked in FastLane
 - also at: <https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/coa.jsp>
- For RII Track-1: submit for ***senior personnel*** in List of Participants (the PI, Co-PIs, and Funded Participants)

C&OA Warnings

- Must use template provided by NSF
- Lists must be complete and current
 - Do *NOT* rely on biographical sketches to collate information
- List only the primary PhD advisor(s), not committee members
- List only primary PhD advisee(s)
- Co-authors and collaborators include those on works pending and in preparation
- Do not list colleagues or acquaintances who are not collaborators, PhD advisors/advisees, co-editors
- The mere sharing of data, software, or IP does not create collaboration or affiliation
- May need to save as text file if problems printing
 - Save as: Text (Tab delimited) (*.txt)

Compliance Checking

- Read the solicitation
- Follow the sections & headings for the Project Description
- Ensure all necessary tables are included
- Ensure Supplemental Documents contain Letters of Collaboration which specify contribution/commitment to project
- Plan your submission for several days before deadline to allow fixes to be made, avoiding Return Without Review
- Budget
 - Proposals lacking budget justification for lead and for each subaward will be returned without review
 - clear justifications needed, ensure that subawards add up correctly
 - List postdocs, graduate, and undergraduate students on Line B
 - Budget justification must give source, nature, and amount of cost share
- Human Subjects and Vertebrate Animals
 - Check box(es) on cover page and submit approvals/exemptions

NSF/NSB Review Criteria

Intellectual Merit (IM):

- Potential to advance knowledge and understanding
- Potentially transformative concepts

Broader Impacts (BI):

- Potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.
 - Is the plan based on a sound rationale?
 - Is there a mechanism to assess success?
 - How well qualified is the individual, team, or institution to conduct the proposed activities?
 - Prior accomplishments of the PIs/participants
 - Are there adequate resources?
- <http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/publications/2011/meritreviewcriteria.pdf>

EPSCoR Merit Review Criteria

Solicitation Specific (RII Track-1)

- Research Capacity
 - Potential to enhance research competitiveness and capacity
- Jurisdictional Impacts
 - Potential to benefit the jurisdiction
- Workforce Development
 - Potential to enhance the STEM workforce and broaden participation
- Integration of Project Elements
 - Potential for added value and benefits
- All criteria are necessary – none alone are sufficient
- Full consideration during review/decision-making

Feedback from Program, Panels

- Core of the proposal is the Intellectual Merit of the Research
- Read/follow the PAPPG
 - https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=papp
- Read/follow the solicitation
 - Project description elements
 - Keep merit review criteria in mind
- Write to the reviewers/panel
 - Provide information that experts in field need to judge the proposed research
 - Avoid jargon that complicates review by broad audience
 - But don't shy away from addressing specialized, domain specific issues
 - Describe research methods, tools, approaches
 - Emphasize unique, novel, or transformative techniques, methods
- Why EPSCoR RII?
 - Demonstrate integration of project elements and jurisdictional impacts

Feedback from Program, Panels ...

Reviewers appreciate your ideas: very good, relevant, important to jurisdictions

Suggestions:

- Research driven by questions or hypotheses that place project in the current context of the research area
- *Avoid couching axioms as hypotheses*
- Research activities, methods, and approaches should address the questions/hypotheses (connect the “why” with “how”)
- Activities should lead to deliverables that support stated goals
- How will success be identified? What will be resulting benefits?
- Claims of integration of research projects (and collaborations) should be substantiated
- How will dependencies of activities/results be addressed?
 - Collection of data needed for modeling; simulation results needed for lab work; development of models or techniques needed for integration

Feedback from Program, Panels ...

- Provide sufficient details for experts to evaluate merit of research
- Demonstrate current awareness of the field/problem
 - Up-to-date, relevant references/citations
 - Address known issues, problems; describe state-of-the-art
- Preliminary results are appreciated
- How is your team uniquely qualified or positioned to perform the proposed work?
- Clear, legible figures with logical connection to the prose
 - Crucial information should not be only in figures
- Proposed work, methods, ideas should not be in Facilities section
- New hires:
 - Should be included where expertise/capacity is needed
 - Should be clearly justified by proposed work
 - Jurisdiction-specific Programmatic Terms and Conditions will require hiring to proceed as proposed

Questions?