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IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

This solicitation updates NSF 17-525. The updates are as follows:

- An additional strand has been added to allow proposals that focus on designing pathways facilitating school districts in developing policies and supports for incorporating computer science and computational thinking across preK-12 or preK-14;
- Proposals submitted to this solicitation may be eligible for co-funding from organizations partnering with NSF as described in Section II; and
- The two Additional Criteria on Broadening Participation have been made more prominent in the text.

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

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

General Information

Program Title:
Computer Science for All (CSforAll:RPP)
Researcher Practitioner Partnerships

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

Cognizant Program Officer(s):
Please note that the following information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

- Janice Cuny, Program Officer, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8489, email: jcuny@nsf.gov
- Karen King, Program Director, EHR/DRL, telephone: (703) 292-5124, email: kking@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):
- 47.070 — Computer and Information Science and Engineering
- 47.076 — Education and Human Resources

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 24

approximately 10 small, 11 medium, and 3 large awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $20,000,000

Subject to the availability of funds

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

The categories of proposers eligible to submit proposals to the National Science Foundation are identified in the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG), Chapter I.E.

Who May Serve as PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

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

There are no restrictions or limits.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- Letters of Intent: Not required
- Preliminary Proposal Submission: Not required
- Full Proposals:

B. Budgetary Information

- Cost Sharing Requirements:
  Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.
- Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:
  Not Applicable
- Other Budgetary Limitations:
I. INTRODUCTION

A key goal of this program is to provide all U.S. students the opportunity to participate in computer science (CS) and computational thinking (CT) education in their schools at the preK-12 levels. CT refers to the thought processes involved in formulating problems and their solutions in such a way that the solutions can be effectively carried out by an information-processing agent (usually a computer).
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

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

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

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

In order to ensure that advances in computing education are inclusive of our diverse student populations (the “for All” part of “CS for All”), proposals on any strand must address, in a significant manner, longstanding underrepresentation in computing. Groups traditionally underrepresented or underserved in computing include women, persons with disabilities, African Americans/Blacks, Hispanic Americans, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, Native Pacific Islanders, and persons from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. All proposals will be evaluated on the two additional Broadening Participation Criteria specific to this solicitation (see Section V.A, Project Description, below).

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

- http://edr.sagepub.com/content/45/4/243.full.pdf+html;
- http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/underImprovementResources;
- http://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org/;
- http://researchandpractice.org/; and
- http://learndbir.org/.

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

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

Proposal Strands:

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

Proposals may be submitted in the following size classes:

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

The size class should also be specified in the first line of the Project Summary.
Co-Funding Opportunities for this Solicitation:

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

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

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


III. AWARD INFORMATION

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 24, approximately 10 small, 11 medium, and 3 large awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $20,000,000

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

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Submit Proposals:
The categories of proposers eligible to submit proposals to the National Science Foundation are identified in the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG), Chapter I.E.

Who May Serve as PI:
There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:
There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI:
There are no restrictions or limits.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

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

- Full proposals submitted via FastLane: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF.
proposed by the project or a third-party evaluator. The external critical review should be sufficiently independent and rigorous to

- frameworks, as well as data collection, analysis, and reporting plans). These might include an external review panel or advisory board

- feedback processes. All projects must have external, critical reviews of their designs and activities (including their theoretical

- Medium and Large projects must describe appropriate mechanisms to assess success through project-specific external review and

- shows. Keywords should be prefaced with "Keywords" followed by a colon, and should be separated by semi-colons.

- please provide two and six sets of keywords at the end of the overview in the Project Summary. EHR and CISE personnel will

- the Project Summary. The first line of the Project Summary should identify the proposal strand: High School Strand, PreK-8 Strand, or PreK-12/PreK-14

- By their very nature, RPPs responding to this solicitation will almost certainly be working with Human Subjects (looking at outcomes for

- 1. Does the proposal identify the characteristics and needs of the identified underrepresented or underserved groups (public or

- 2. Does the proposal include specific plans or strategies for addressing or accommodating the particular needs of participants of

- Reviews will be asked to specifically evaluate the proposal on these two criteria as well as the two standard NSF Merit Review

- In addition to the guidance provided in the PAPPG on Project Description preparation, the Project Description for Medium and Large

- specify initial, jointly-developed research questions and document the investment of the partners in those questions;

- specify work plans for implementation, data collection, analysis, improvement, and use;

- describe the management and administrative structures with the capacity to administer the program; and

- draw from RPP literature on assessing/evaluating the quality of the partnership to articulate plans for assessing the success of

- Medium and Large projects must describe appropriate mechanisms to assess success through project-specific external review and

- 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

- Human Subjects

- This program solicitation is particularly interested in broadening participation in CS and CT for groups that have been traditionally

- Collaborative Proposals. All collaborative proposals submitted as separate submissions from multiple organizations must be submitted

- 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. Proposers are reminded to identify

- This box should not be left blank.

- COVER SHEET:

- PROJECT SUMMARY:

- PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

- PreK-12/PreK-14 Pathways Strand. In addition it should list the size class of the proposal (Small, Medium or Large).

- Please provide between two and six sets of keywords at the end of the overview in the Project Summary. EHR and CISE personnel will

- All proposals must explicitly address broadening participation with respect to the two Additional Criteria:

- Failure to submit this proposal may delay processing. Full proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.

- Full proposals submitted via Grants.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation via Grants.gov should be

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

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

- The first line of the Project Summary should identify the proposal strand: High School Strand, PreK-8 Strand, or PreK-12/PreK-14

- By their very nature, RPPs responding to this solicitation will almost certainly be working with Human Subjects (looking at outcomes for

- Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts). Proposals that do not adequately address these additional criteria will be declined.

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

- It should list the size class of the proposal (Small, Medium or Large).

- Please provide between two and six sets of keywords at the end of the overview in the Project Summary. EHR and CISE personnel will

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

- The Human Subjects box should not be left blank: The Human Subjects box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of “approved” or “exempt”, or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in the PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5.

- PROJECT SUMMARY:

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

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

- The Human Subjects box should not be left blank: The Human Subjects box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of “approved” or “exempt”, or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in the PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5.

- PROJECT SUMMARY:

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

- Please provide between two and six sets of keywords at the end of the overview in the Project Summary. EHR and CISE personnel will

- By their very nature, RPPs responding to this solicitation will almost certainly be working with Human Subjects (looking at outcomes for

- Cover Sheet:

- This program solicitation is particularly interested in broadening participation in CS and CT for groups that have been traditionally

- Collaborative Proposals. All collaborative proposals submitted as separate submissions from multiple organizations must be submitted

- The Human Subjects box should not be left blank: The Human Subjects box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of “approved” or “exempt”, or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in the PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5.
influence the project’s activities and improve the quality of its findings. Successful proposals will (1) describe the expertise of the external reviewer(s); (2) explain how that expertise relates to the goals and objectives of the proposal; and (3) specify how the PI will report and use results of the project’s external, critical review process. Proposers may wish to consider resources on evaluating RPPs, such as http://rpp.wtgrantfoundation.org/evaluating-research-practice-partnerships.

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

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

SPECIAL INFORMATION AND SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTS:

List of Project Personnel

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

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

SINGLE COPY DOCUMENTS:

Collaborators and Other Affiliations Information:

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

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

SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

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

For all proposals, regardless of size:

- On the cover sheet, mark the Human Subjects box as pending, approved, or exempted (with exemption subsection indicated). This box should not be left blank. The Human Subjects box should be marked as pending if an IRB is either (1) reviewing the project plan and has not yet determined a ruling of "approved" or "exempt"; or (2) the project plan has not yet been submitted to an IRB for review. Additional guidance on the use of Human Subjects is available in the PAPPG, Chapter II.D.5.
- The first line of the overview of the Project Summary must indicate the proposal strand and size class from among the options specified in the Program Description of this solicitation.
- The last line of the Project Summary should consist of the word “Keywords” followed by a colon and between 2-6 keywords, separated by semi-colons.
- In addition to addressing Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts, all proposals must address the two additional broadening participation criteria listed above under “Project Description.”
- Letters of Collaboration are permitted as Supplementary Documents. Letters of Support are not allowed; reviewers will be instructed not to consider those letters in reviewing the merits of the proposal.
- (RWR) All proposals must address evaluation plans.

For Small proposals:

- (RWR) The budget shown on the cover page and on the budget sheets must not exceed $300,000, plus funds for embedded REU supplements.

For Medium proposals:

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

For Large proposals:

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

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

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

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

C. Due Dates

- Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter’s local time):
  - May 09, 2018
  - February 12, 2019
  - Second Tuesday in February, Annually Thereafter

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

For Proposals Submitted Via FastLane or Research.gov:

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

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once registered, the applicant’s organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website. Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage: 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 or Research.gov may use Research.gov to verify the status of their submission to NSF. For proposers that submitted via Grants.gov, until an application has been received and validated by NSF, the Authorized Organizational Representative may check the status of an application on Grants.gov. After proposers have received an e-mail notification from NSF, Research.gov should be used to check the status of an application.

VI. NSF PROPOSAL PROCESSING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES
Proposals received by NSF are assigned to the appropriate NSF program for acknowledgement and, if they meet NSF requirements, for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an NSF Program Officer, and usually by three to ten other persons outside NSF either as ad hoc reviewers, panelists, or both, who are experts in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with oversight of the review process. Proposers are invited to suggest names of persons they believe are especially well qualified to review the proposal and/or persons they would prefer not review the proposal. These suggestions may serve as one source in the reviewer selection process at the Program Officer’s discretion. Submission of such names, however, is optional. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition, Program Officers may obtain comments from site visits before recommending final action on proposals. Senior NSF staff further review recommendations for awards. A flowchart that depicts the entire NSF proposal and award process (and associated timeline) is included in PAPPG Exhibit III-1.

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

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

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

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

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

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

1. Merit Review Principles

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

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

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of these 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
After programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants

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

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
   a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
   b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?

2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?

3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?

4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?

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

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

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

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

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

1. Does the proposal identify the characteristics and needs of the identified underrepresented or underserved groups to be addressed?

2. Does the proposal include specific plans or strategies for addressing or accommodating the particular needs of participants of the identified underrepresented groups?

B. Review and Selection Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

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

B. Award Conditions

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

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's Website at https://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.


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.


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

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

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:

- Janice Cuny, Program Officer, CISE/CNS, telephone: (703) 292-8489, email: jcuny@nsf.gov
- Karen King, Program Director, EHR/DRL, telephone: (703) 292-5124, email: kking@nsf.gov

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

- FastLane and Research.gov Help Desk: 1-800-673-6188
  FastLane Help Desk e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.
  Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: rgov@nsf.gov

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:

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

IX. OTHER INFORMATION

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

Grants.gov provides an additional electronic capability to search for Federal government-wide grant opportunities. NSF funding opportunities may be accessed via this mechanism. Further information on Grants.gov may be obtained at 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 (FASED) 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.
To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov

- **Location:** 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314
- **For General Information**
  (NSF Information Center): (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090
- **To Order Publications or Forms:**
  Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov
  or telephone: (703) 292-7827
- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

**PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS**

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding applicants or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal InvestigatorProposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004), and NSF-51, "ReviewerProposal 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
Alexandria, VA 22314