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FY 2009 Budget Highlights

- Cross-Foundation Investments
- Support for Research Grants
- New Faculty & Beginning Investigators
- Graduate Research Fellowships
- Science & Technology Centers
- Cybersecurity
- International Science & Engineering
- Oceans Research
FY 2009 Budget Highlights (continued)

- Polar Research & Logistics
- Major Research Equipment & Facilities Construction (MREFC)
- Enriching the Education of STEM Teachers
- Promoting Learning through Research and Evaluation
- Broadening Participation
- Interagency R&D Priorities
- Stewardship
FY 2009 Outcomes

- CR through March 6, 2009

- Congressional action in February will likely be impacted by outcomes of the November elections

- FY 2010 budget request will be submitted by next President – maybe ~ April 1, 2009
America Creating Opportunities to Meaningfully Promote Excellence in Technology, Education, and Science Act: America COMPETES Act

- Signed into law on August 9, 2007
- Shares goals of the American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI)
- Focuses on three primary areas of importance:
  - Increasing research investment;
  - Strengthening educational opportunities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics from elementary through graduate school;
  - Developing an innovation infrastructure.
NSF’s America Competes Act Policy Provisions Update
ACA Policy-Related Provisions of Interest to the Research Community

- SEC 7008: Postdoctoral Research Fellows
- SEC 7009: Responsible Conduct of Research
- SEC 7010: Reporting of Research Results
- SEC 7013: Cost Sharing
SEC 7008: Postdoctoral Research Fellows

“Mentoring - The Director shall require that all grant applications that include funding to support postdoctoral researchers include a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided for such individuals, and shall ensure that this part of the application is evaluated under the Foundation's broader impacts merit review criterion. Mentoring activities may include career counseling, training in preparing grant applications, guidance on ways to improve teaching skills, and training in research ethics.

Reports - The Director shall require that annual reports and the final report for research grants that include funding to support postdoctoral researchers include a description of the mentoring activities provided to such researchers.”
Section 7008 Implementation Strategy

- Section 7008 has been implemented via revisions to the relevant sections of the Grant Proposal Guide (GPG), the FastLane Project Reporting System, and the Representative Activities of Broader Impacts document that is posted on the NSF website.

- Each proposal that contains postdoctoral researchers must include, as a separate section within the Project Description, a description of the mentoring activities to be provided to such individuals.

- No change to the existing 15-page project description limitation!
The following new paragraph has been added to the Project Description section of the GPG:

“Each proposal that requests funding to support postdoctoral researchers must include, as a separate section within the 15-page project description, a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided for such individuals. Examples of mentoring activities include, but are not limited to: career counseling; training in preparation of grant proposals, publications and presentations; guidance on ways to improve teaching and mentoring skills; guidance on how to effectively collaborate with researchers from diverse backgrounds and disciplinary areas; and training in responsible professional practices. The proposed mentoring activities will be evaluated as part of the merit review process under the Foundation's broader impacts merit review criterion. Proposals that do not include a separate section on mentoring activities within the Project Description will be returned without review.”
The Review Criteria section of the GPG has been revised to add language stating that the mentoring activities described in the Project Description will be evaluated under the Broader Impacts criterion.

The Return without Review section and the Proposal Preparation Checklist will emphasize that proposals that do not describe mentoring activities provided to postdoctoral researchers will be returned without review.
Section 7008 Implementation (continued)

- The FastLane project reporting format is being modified to inform PIs of the requirement to report on the mentoring activities provided to postdoctoral researchers during the performance period.
  - This includes any postdoctoral researcher not identified in the original proposal submission!
ACA Section 7008
Project Reporting Screenshots

Extracts from the FastLane Project Reporting System

Activities and Findings

This section will serve as your report to your program officer of your project’s activities and findings. Please describe what you have done and what you have learned, broken down into four categories:

1. Describe the major research and education activities of the project. **What? Why?**

2. Describe the major findings resulting from these activities. **What? Why?**

3. Describe the opportunities for training and development provided by your project. **What? Why?**

4. Describe outreach activities your project has undertaken. **What? Why?**

3. Describe the opportunities for training, development and mentoring provided by your project.

If in doubt about the category in which to report a particular result, please use the **What?** buttons. If still in doubt, report in whichever category seems to you closest.
ACA Section 7008
Project Reporting Screenshots

Training and Development – What?

Please summarize how the project has contributed to the research and teaching skills and experience of those who have worked on the project, such as undergraduate students, graduate students, post-docs, college faculty, and K-12 teachers. If you have nothing (yet) to report, please click the corresponding button.

Outreach Activities – What?

Please summarize any project activities that aimed to reach out to members of communities who are not usually aware of your activities, for the purpose of enhancing participation in science learning and careers in science, public understanding of science and technology, or the like. If you have nothing (yet) to report, please click the corresponding button.

Later screens will invite you to identify any books or concrete products that have resulted from such activities and to say how the project has contributed beyond its own boundaries to education and development of human resources.

Please summarize the contributions to the research and teaching skills and experience of those who have worked on the project, including undergraduate students, graduate students, post-docs, college faculty, and K-12 teachers. If your project supported postdoctoral researchers, then you must include a summary of the mentoring activities conducted.
Contributions to Human Resources Development – What?

Describe how your project has contributed to human resource development in science, engineering, and technology by:

- providing opportunities for research and teaching in science and engineering areas;
- improving the performance, skills, or attitudes of members of underrepresented groups that will improve their access to or retention in research and teaching careers;
- developing and disseminating new educational materials or providing scholarships; or
- providing exposure to science and technology for pre-college teachers, young people, and other non-scientist members of the public.

Contributions to Human Resources Development – Why?

A major aim of NSF programs is to contribute to the human resource base for science and technology, including the base of understanding among those who are not themselves scientist or engineers. A core SF strategy is to encourage integration of research and education. NSF needs to know and be able to describe how the work we support actually furthers that aim and that strategy. Moreover, contributions of this sort are important in the evaluation of results from your project when we and reviewers are considering a new proposal.
SEC 7010: Reporting of Research Results

“The Director shall ensure that all final project reports and citations of published research documents resulting from research funded, in whole or in part, by the Foundation, are made available to the public in a timely manner and in electronic form through the Foundation's Website.”

Implementation Status: The Foundation already provides citations of published research on our website. We do not, however, currently require a final “cumulative” report of funded activities. The Foundation continues to discuss the appropriate mechanism for disseminating the outcomes of NSF-funded projects, including ways to minimize the associated burden on PIs and NSF staff.
SEC 7013: Cost Sharing

- Section 7013 of the America COMPETES Act directed the National Science Board (Board) to “evaluate the impact of its [2004] policy to eliminate cost sharing for research grants and cooperative agreements for existing programs that were developed around industry partnerships and historically required industry cost sharing, such as the Engineering Research Centers and Industry/University Cooperative Research Centers.” The Act directed that the Board “also consider the impact that the cost sharing policy has on initiating new programs for which industry interest and participation are sought.”

- The First NSB Cost Sharing Report was delivered to Congress on February 8, 2008.
Other Significant Changes

- Faculty salary CLARIFICATION
- Definition of PI
- Replacement of the Small Grants for Exploratory Research Program with:
  - RAPID
  - EAGER
Existing Faculty Summer Salary Policy

“As a general policy, NSF recognizes that salaries of faculty members and other personnel associated directly with the project constitute appropriate direct costs and may be requested in proportion to the effort devoted to the project.

NSF regards research as one of the normal functions of faculty members at institutions of higher education. Compensation for time normally spent on research within the term of appointment is deemed to be included within the faculty member’s regular organizational salary.

Summer salary for faculty members at colleges and universities on academic-year appointments is limited to no more than two-ninths of their regular academic-year salary. This limit includes summer salary received from all NSF-funded grants.”

The existing policy was originally issued in 1978;
Reference NSF 78-41: Grants for Scientific Research
Revised Faculty Salary Policy

- Limits salary compensation for senior project personnel to no more than two months of their regular salary in any one year:
  - The limit includes salary compensation received from all NSF-funded awards.
  - Broadens the previous policy away from the concept of “two summer months” and allows senior project personnel to schedule work when appropriate throughout the year.
  - Any compensation in excess of two months must be specifically justified in the proposal, and if approved by NSF, will be included in the award budget.
PI/co-PI Definition

- In January 2005, OSTP issued a new policy regarding the treatment – and recognition - of multiple Principal Investigators under Federal research awards.
- Agencies were tasked with development of their final implementation plans for posting to the RBM website.
- The Foundation has long permitted proposers to identify multiple PIs (through use of the terms PI and co-PI(s)) on proposals submitted to NSF.
  - The first set of proposal preparation guidelines that provided the ability to identify multiple PIs was issued in 1963.
  - NSF has an excellent track record in implementing this concept in our proposal preparation guidelines, electronic systems, recognition of separately submitted collaborative proposals from multiple institutions, as well as access to proposal and award information by PIs and co-PIs.
From an NSF perspective, the most significant issue regarding development of the Foundation’s implementation plan related to assessment of our PI definition to ensure compliance with the OSTP definition.

Upon consideration of this issue, NSF modified its PI definition to read as follows:

(co) Principal Investigator(s) -- the individual(s) designated by the proposer, and approved by NSF, who will be responsible for the scientific or technical direction of the project. NSF does not infer any distinction in scientific stature among multiple PIs, whether referred to as PI or co-PI. If more than one, the first one listed will serve as the contact PI, with whom all communications between NSF program officials and the project relating to the scientific, technical, and budgetary aspects of the project should take place. The PI and any identified co-PIs, however, will be jointly responsible for submission of the requisite project reports.
Grants for Rapid Response Research (RAPID)

Rapid release of funds and expedited merit review

The RAPID funding mechanism would be used for projects having a:

“severe urgency with regard to availability of, or access to data, facilities or specialized equipment, including quick-response research on natural or anthropogenic disasters and similar unanticipated events”
RAPID (continued)

- Requests may be for up to $200K and of one year duration. Award size, however, should be consistent with:
  - Project scope
  - Existing grants in similar areas
- Only internal review required (external review in rare cases permissible with notification to PI)
- No cost extensions and requests for supplemental funding in accordance with existing NSF policies
- Follow-on full proposals – “RAPID renewals” – externally reviewed
EArly-concept Grants for Exploratory Research (EAGER)

- Exploratory work on *potentially transformative* untested/novel research ideas or approaches in their early stages
- High risk-high payoff projects that
  - Involve radically different approaches;
  - Apply new expertise; or,
  - Engage novel disciplinary or interdisciplinary perspectives

PTR is already supported by NSF in many ways – EAGERER would be just one more way!!
Requests may be for up to $300K and up to two years duration. Award size, however, should be consistent with:

- Project scope
- Existing grants in similar areas

Review process, no cost extensions, requests for supplemental funding, and follow-on full proposals would follow same rules as RAPID proposals.
New Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide Implementation

- Posted on the NSF website on October 1, 2008
- Effective date is January 5th, 2009
- All new funding opportunities with target/deadline dates after January 5th, 2009 will be subject to the new requirements
NSF Grants.gov Implementation in FY 2009

- Unless otherwise specified, optional submission for the vast majority of NSF programs
  - Note that after October 1, 2008, any funding opportunity that is posted will require use of FastLane until Adobe forms are implemented!!

- Will not be used until a Grants.gov solution has been developed for:
  - Separately submitted collaborative proposals
  - Fellowship programs that require submission of reference letters