MPS-Ascend External Mentoring (MPS-Ascend EM)

PROGRAM SOLICITATION
NSF 22-524

Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):
February 15, 2022

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the revised NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG) (NSF 22-1), which is effective for proposals submitted, or due, on or after October 4, 2021.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

General Information

Program Title:
MPS-Ascend External Mentoring (MPS-Ascend EM)

Synopsis of Program:
The MPS-Ascend External Mentoring (MPS-Ascend EM) program aims to fund an institution (or collaboration of institutions) to provide a mentored career development program specifically designed for two cohorts of MPS-Ascend Fellows funded through the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Ascending Postdoctoral Research Fellowships (MPS-Ascend NSF 21-573, and NSF 22-501) programs. These activities should be designed to build cohort experiences for MPS-Ascend Fellows funded through the MPS competitions, provide professional development opportunities, and provide appropriate mentoring and professional networks to allow the Fellows to transition into, advance, and succeed in independent academic (or other) research careers. Each proposal should address the complete spectrum of MPS-Ascend Fellows, across all MPS fields. Approximately 30-50 MPS-Ascend Fellows are expected per cohort.

The aforementioned MPS-Ascend program supports future research leaders in all MPS fields (Astronomical Sciences, Chemistry, Physics, Materials Research, Mathematical Sciences) by funding their participation in postdoctoral research environments that will have maximal impact on their future scientific development. This program has a strong emphasis on increasing the participation of members of those groups most underrepresented as leaders in MPS fields, which includes Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics, Latinos, and Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Native Pacific Islanders. Details of the MPS-Ascend program can be found here: https://beta.nsf.gov/funding/opportunities/mathematical-and-physical-sciences-ascending-postdoctoral-research.

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.

- Michelle M. Bushey, telephone: (703) 292-4938, email: mbushey@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):
- 47.049 --- Mathematical and Physical Sciences

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 1
Collaborative proposals are allowed and encouraged.

**Anticipated Funding Amount:** $900,000

One three year award is anticipated for up to $900,000.

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are 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. Unaffiliated individuals are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this solicitation.

**Who May Serve as PI:**

There are no restrictions or limits.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:** 2

An organization may participate in up to two proposals as the lead or as a non-lead collaborating organization or as a sub awardee, but only in at most one of these can an organization participate as the lead organization.

If an organization submits or participates in more proposals than this solicitation allows, only the earliest compliant proposal(s) will be retained and any subsequent proposals will be returned without review.

**Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI:** 1

A proposer may participate as a PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel on one proposal.

If a proposer submits more proposals as PI/co-PI/Senior Personnel than this solicitation allows, only the earliest compliant proposal(s) will be retained and any subsequent proposals will be returned without review.

**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:**
  - Not Applicable

**C. Due Dates**

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):**
  - February 15, 2022

**Proposal Review Information Criteria**

**Merit Review Criteria:**

National Science Board approved criteria. Additional merit review criteria apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.
I. INTRODUCTION

The future of the Nation’s scientific enterprise depends on including the best and most highly trained minds in the pursuit of cutting-edge scientific problems. This solicitation aims to support mentored career development activities for two cohorts of postdoctoral Fellows in the MPS-Ascend program. The activities funded through this solicitation are expected to be in addition to those provided by the research mentors, and are expected to focus on cohort building, professional development, and career mentoring.

The intent is to fund an organization (or collaboration of organizations) that will provide these Fellows with the tools and connections (e.g. research and social networks) they will need to become leaders in their scientific community. Fellows supported through NSF 21-573 and through NSF 22-501 each form distinct cohorts, each spanning all MPS fields. Building these two cohorts of Fellows across MPS fields is an important aspect of the Fellows program. It is expected that each proposal will develop a plan to provide activities for the two cohorts of Fellows. Each cohort is mentored separately. Bringing each cohort of Fellows together for workshops or other activities is encouraged, either virtually or in person (when possible and safe). Bringing the two cohorts together for additional activities is also strongly encouraged. Collaborations of organizations are welcome but the project plan must provide activities for each cohort of Fellows.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The successful proposal will describe plans to build and provide:

Mentoring and Professional Development: provide career mentoring aimed at building success at the postdoctoral level as Fellows prepare to transition to the next career stage. MPS anticipates that preparation for faculty careers will be a major focus of the program, although other career paths should also be addressed. Potential topics could include academic and other scientific career job search strategies; leadership; negotiation; communication skills; networking; grant proposal preparation (for NSF and other agencies, as appropriate); scientific publishing; laboratory management (where appropriate); budgeting; hiring; mentoring; surmounting challenges; managing career challenges and expectations; academic advancement; and balancing teaching, research, service, and life-work balance.

Cohort-building Activities: provide activities that encourage network building and mutual support among the MPS-Ascend Fellows at every stage of the program. Workshops and meetings, either in person or virtual, should be considered. A meeting at NSF for Fellows to present their work could be included among these activities or addressed separately in a future request.

National Network: build a national network of volunteer expert scientists in MPS fields that will be available to the Fellows for less formal mentoring. Informal mentors who are knowledgeable about the potential barriers for members of underrepresented groups including Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics, Latinos, and Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Native Pacific Islanders in STEM fields would be especially welcome. Approaches
that address intersectional perspectives; peer to peer mentoring within the cohorts; peer to near-peer mentoring between the two cohorts are all encouraged. Potential PIs are encouraged to consider mentoring and professional development models from other programs and agencies. Proposals must demonstrate how the program addresses the needs of disciplines served by MPS.

III. AWARD INFORMATION

Anticipated Type of Award: Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 1

Collaborative proposals are allowed and encouraged.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $900,000

One three year award is anticipated for up to $900,000.

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. Unaffiliated individuals are not eligible to submit proposals in response to this solicitation.

Who May Serve as PI:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization: 2

An organization may participate in up to two proposals as the lead or as a non-lead collaborating organization or as a sub awardee, but only in at most one of these can an organization participate as the lead organization.

If an organization submits or participates in more proposals than this solicitation allows, only the earliest compliant proposal(s) will be retained and any subsequent proposals will be returned without review.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI: 1

A proposer may participate as a PI, co-PI, or Senior Personnel on one proposal.

If a proposer submits more proposals as PI/co-PI/Senior Personnel than this solicitation allows, only the earliest compliant proposal(s) will be retained and any subsequent proposals will be returned without review.

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 Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. Proposers are reminded to identify this program solicitation number in the program solicitation block on the NSF Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.
- Full Proposals submitted via 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) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.
In determining which method to utilize in the electronic preparation and submission of the proposal, please note the following:

**Collaborative Proposals.** All collaborative proposals submitted as separate submissions from multiple organizations must be submitted via FastLane or Research.gov. PAPPG Chapter II.D.3 provides additional information on collaborative proposals.

See PAPPG Chapter II.C.2 for guidance on the required sections of a full research proposal submitted to NSF. Please note that the proposal preparation instructions provided in this program solicitation may deviate from the PAPPG instructions.

**Project Summary:**

The project summary may not be more than one page in length and must consist of three parts:

- In the Overview section, give a summary of the proposed effort, and briefly describe how this project will impact MPS-Ascend Fellows in all MPS fields. In addition, briefly describe any proposed partnerships; and
- Provide a succinct summary of the intellectual merit of the proposed project; and
- Describe the broader impacts of the proposed work, including the potential long-term impact on both the NSF supported MPS-Ascend Fellows and broadening participation efforts across MPS fields.

**Project Description (15 page limit):**

This narrative description, not to exceed 15 pages (including tables, figures, and other visual supplements), should contain a detailed statement of the work to be undertaken and will be the basis for evaluation of the intellectual merit and broader impacts of the proposal. Note that there are two distinct MPS-Ascend Program Fellow cohorts and each includes all MPS disciplines; it is expected that the proposed activities will include all MPS disciplines. The Project Description should describe a comprehensive plan for career mentoring, cohort building, and professional development for the MPS-Ascend Fellows. An individual plan for each of these three aspects should be included, as well as a description of how each aspect will work together for the benefit of the two cohorts of Fellows. The plans for creating a network of informal mentors (including scientists familiar with the challenges that can face underrepresented groups, especially Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics, Latinos, and Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Native Pacific Islanders in STEM fields) should also be described. Assessment is an important part of this project, and a formative and summative project assessment plan and mechanisms to address any needed changes should be included. For proposals with more than one partner, the role of each partner should be described, as well as the overall management plan.

**Supplementary Documentation:**

When applicable: If the proposal involves organizations other than the performing organization, list all partners.

When applicable: If a proposed effort involves a private sector partner or other organization serving as a partner (e.g., through a memorandum of understanding or other legal document), a letter (one page maximum) confirming the organization’s participation must be included. This letter should confirm the role of the partner as described in the project summary of the proposal.

When applicable: Statements from individuals, on institutional letterhead, confirming substantive collaboration efforts may be submitted, but they must follow only the format indicated below.

By signing below I acknowledge that I am listed as a collaborator on a proposal entitled "______(proposal title)______," with ______(PI name)______ as the Principal Investigator. I agree to undertake the tasks assigned to me, as described in the proposal, and I commit to provide or make available the resources therein ascribed to me.

Signed: _______________________ Print Name:_______________________________

Date: _________________________ Institution:________________________________

Not allowed:

Statement of collaboration beyond those specified above, including letters of support/endorsement, are not allowed.

**B. Budgetary Information**

**Cost Sharing:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

**C. Due Dates**

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):
  
  February 15, 2022

**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=proposal_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: https://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 those activities.

These three merit review principles provide the basis for the merit review criteria, as well as a context within which the users of the criteria can better understand their intent.

### 2. Merit Review Criteria

All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of the two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities.

The two merit review criteria are listed below. Both criteria are to be given full consideration during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria. (PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i), contains additional information for use by proposers in development of the Project Description section of the proposal). Reviewers are strongly encouraged to review the criteria, including PAPPG Chapter II.C.2.d(i), prior to the review of a proposal.

When evaluating NSF proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit:** The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and
- **Broader Impacts:** The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

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

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
   a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
   b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. NSF values the advancement of scientific knowledge and activities that contribute to achievement of societal-relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); improved STEM education and educator development at any level; achievement of societally relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); improved STEM education and educator development at any level; achievement of societally relevant outcomes.

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

The Ascend-EM proposals will also be evaluated on the following:

- Are the planned activities appropriate, with value across MPS fields?
- Are the plans to provide professional development activities appropriate and well considered? Do they have the potential to prepare MPS-Ascend Fellows for leadership roles in their fields? Are differences in scientific approaches (large collaborations, table-top science, interdisciplinary, theory, etc) addressed satisfactorily?
- Are the plans for building a cohort experience across the Fellows well thought out?
- Are the plans for career mentoring well thought out?
- Is there a plan for creating a network of informal mentors (including scientists familiar with the challenges that can face members of underrepresented groups, especially Blacks or African Americans, Hispanics, Latinos, and Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians and other Native Pacific Islanders in STEM fields)? Is the plan likely to succeed?
- Is the project assessment plan and mechanisms to address any needed changes adequate?

### B. Review and Selection Process

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

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two National Science Board approved merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal’s review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.
After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer’s recommendation.

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

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including 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/awardsmaking/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 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.


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:

- Michelle M. Bushey, telephone: (703) 292-4938, email: mbushey@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 https://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.
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