AISL Webinar 101

Operator:
Today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. As we are attempting to maintain confidentiality of the participants, when we get to the question-and-answer period, please omit your name and institution when you're speaking.

Ellen McCallie:
Please note that the goal of this webinar is to help make the solicitation more accessible. However, please note that details in the actual solicitation override anything presented in this webinar. [**Editor's note:** Any errors or areas that weren't as clear as we'd like have been modified in this transcript.]

Good afternoon, and welcome to the Advancing Informal STEM Learning, AISL, webinar. AISL is a program within the NSF Directorate of Education and Human Resources, Division of Research on Learning and Formal and Informal Environment.

We are focusing on an overview of the AISL program and the solicitations, the project types that we fund, suggestions for preparing a competitive proposal, how your proposal will be reviewed, including merit review criteria. We have also attached several reference slides and slides about other NSF programs that you might be interested in, that you can review later.

Please note: In the solicitation and then also several places in this webinar, we have put in the drlaisl@nsf.gov email address. Again, contact us via drlaisl@nsf.gov. We encourage you to use this email address, because Al DeSena, who is one of our program officers, and Pamela Brooks-Pope, the program specialist for AISL, read each email and then route it to the appropriate program officer based on the content of your request and the availability of program officers. This email address is often the fastest and the best way to get a response. That said, if you have questions about a resubmission of a proposal, do feel free to email the program officer who handled the original proposal.

Finally, on many of the slides, you will see a solicitation number, 13-608, and a page number. In other words, we are trying to align all of our slides during this webinar to the actual solicitation that you may or may not have in front of you.

Bob Russell:
Thank you very much. AISL resides within the Division on Research and Learning in Informal and Formal Settings (DRL). The programs in this division focus on research and development related to STEM learning, learning environments, broadening participation, and workforce development. In terms of AISL, each of the words in Advancing Informal STEM Learning has meaning within our program. "Advancing" is very important. It is the whole idea of research and development: advancing the field, building knowledge.

"Informal" refers to projects that happen in informal or out-of-school learning environments, such as museums, after school, media; any kind of STEM learning that occurs outside the formal classroom. That's the informal part.

"STEM" includes not only science but technology, engineering, and mathematics. So the point there is that projects can, of course, focus on a single scientific discipline. But they can also encompass projects that incorporate technology or mathematics or the mathematics underlying some biological concepts, et cetera. The program cuts across all of those.

Finally, AISL focuses on projects that are designed to impact "learning." But learning is not defined only as learning content knowledge or cognitive concepts. We define learning impacts as the informal science education field does: as having a broader definition, including interest, motivation, engagement, and so forth. (Please see the References section of the solicitation for several national level publications discussing the range of ways to consider learning in informal STEM environments.)

Now regarding the solicitation, here are some important dates coming up. January 14th is when the proposals are due. The funding for that competition will come out of the current fiscal year (FY 2014). There will be another deadline in 2014 -- November 14, 2014. The funding for those projects will come out of Fiscal Year 2015 funding. So there will be no January 2015 deadline.

Please read the program solicitation several times, because solicitation is the guide to the program. It contains the details regarding this particular program and writing a competitive proposal. **This webinar is to help make the solicitation more accessible. However, please note that details in the actual solicitation override anything presented in this webinar.**

Ellen McCallie:
I'm assuming you have the solicitation in front of you and that you have read it a couple of times. At the top, right hand side of each slide we present today, there is a solicitation reference page number to help connect our discussion to the solicitation.

The primary changes in this solicitation:
1. We are not accepting preliminary proposals.
2. We have changed the proposal types.
3. The biggest change is probably in terms of evaluation, which we now call evaluation and external review. And there's a revised description of dissemination, though the content and the intent of dissemination is very similar to previous years.

Bob Russell
I'll make a few points about some general ideas that underlie the program and the solicitation. The AISL program is part of the National Science Foundation, and the National Science Foundation funds research and development. So, as I said earlier, all the projects funded in DRL are research and/or development projects; so that means the proposals that are funded are ones that are identified by reviewers and staff as building knowledge, whether that means research and development on how people learn or on different learning environments, exhibit techniques, media, online learning, or how these things work with different groups of learners. It is important that proposals are designed to build knowledge about how people learn or how they learn within different learning environments.

When a proposal is put together for NSF it should include a review of the relevant literature in that particular field so that the proposer demonstrates that he or she understands what's going on in that area of research and practice and is basing the proposed project on current knowledge. The same is true for the AISL program: you should base your project on what you know about what the arena in which you're working: exhibits, giant screen films, etc., or a combination of learning resources. What do we currently know about how people learn from that resource or within that environment, or if you have a particular target audience, what is relevant about that audience with regard to what you're doing in your project? So you should include critical citations both from research literature that you've identified as well as practice. So you should cite relevant research and practice so that you can make the case that your project is on a solid foundation and that there is a reason to believe it will advance the field.

When we talk about generating new knowledge, you have to have good questions. These questions can be asked as part of the research project or as part of a research and development project that you're developing. So you may be developing some new approach to some type of informal learning and so you can pose some questions about how this approach may work, with whom it'll work, how it works, what is happening, to what extent this contributes, you know, to learning, et cetera.

It's important to have really solid questions, and that the questions have relevance beyond your particular project so that they really do build knowledge for the field. Within your project, you should identify learning outcomes for your audiences, if appropriate. For example, if you're developing a new technique or learning environment, what learning outcomes do you anticipate from that? What will people learn? How will their interests increase? How will their motivation increase? Or whatever the specific learning impacts that your project may have. Obviously, your questions should be project specific. And, as I've already said, what you're doing should be based on your review of research and practice so that your project is based on that knowledge and on those theoretical approaches and on the findings from that research.

Ellen McCallie:
That said, we do not, at NSF, indicate what kind of methods that you use. Both qualitative and quantitative methods are very acceptable. And we don't have a preference for methodologies or methods. Again, as Bob said, what's most important is that these align with the questions that you're asking.

Also, a couple of people have asked about learning impacts or learning outcomes. And there are references on page 6 of the solicitation to part of the recent literature in informal science education that focuses on learning impacts and learning outcomes.
I'd like to make an overall point about funding levels as we've had questions in terms of the range of funding levels. We've introduced lower limits for all project types except for Pathways. For example, $500,000 is the lower level for Broad Implementation.

Bob Russell:
The point here is that you don't have to ask for the maximum amount. You should just ask for the amount of money you need to do your project. And it won't be more competitive or less

competitive, depending on how much money you ask for, other than you should ask for the amount of money that you really need to do you project.

Ellen McCallie:
Right. Funds are tight. So we do check to see if what you're asking for makes sense.

Now we'll look to project types as they've changed somewhat from the previous solicitation. I'm going to try to give you a quick way to differentiate them.

Pathways: The Pathways project type is designed for exploratory projects, proof of concepts, and feasibility studies. They are the kind of work that's needed before engaging in larger scale, deeper, or more specific research or development projects. In terms of presenting your Pathways project, you'll also need to be very explicit in terms of what this Pathways project could potentially lead to. So if you have a proof of concept, what would the next phase be? In other words, Pathways projects are not intended to be small-scale stand-alone projects. They lead to something bigger.

Next is the **Research and Service to Practice (RSP)** project type. It is most similar to last year's research projects. Research and service to practice -- the name was changed to make it more explicit that the research that AISL funds is to improve our understanding of practice and to improve the impacts practice has.

RSP projects have at their core a compelling research question about practice, about how people learn, or about specific learning environment, for example. For this project type, most of your energy and effort is centered around the research, doing the research.

For example, if I'm developing an embedded assessment to use as part of a community program that's already going on, I'm probably going to submit for research and practice because my primary work will be developing an assessment. Most of my energy and effort would be developing and testing the assessment to be used as part of the community program.

Similarly, if I'm seeking to understand the role of interest in an exhibition or the role of interest in determining who participates in a multimedia platform, I'm going to be spending most of my time and energy on the research component of this project and therefore it would be a Research in Service to Practice project type.

Now on that same continuum is **Innovations in Development**. Innovations in Development projects focus on and leverage the development of a product, a model, a tool, or a resource in order to better understand and inform practice. In general, more effort and more resources will be invested in iterative development of the product (resource, program, etc.), like a game, a television series, an exhibition, a youth or community program, or a citizen science project, than in the Research and Service to Practice project type.

For example, if you're developing a large format film or an exhibition that will help elucidate how people learn about some STEM concept, skill, or other learning impact, that's Innovations in Development. You're still going to have a knowledge-building component in Innovations in

Development. It may be research. It may be evaluation. If it's in research, it will be included in the project design section of your proposal. This begs the question: If I'm doing research, is it always a Research in Service to Practice project type? And, again, this goes back to the question: Are you spending more resources in the actual research component? (If so, this is a better for Research in Service to Practice.) Or, are you expending more resources and more effort developing a product, model, or tool and thereby generating knowledge? This would be on the Innovations in Development continuum. Look at it in terms of where you're putting most of your energy and resources, that should help you make the decision.

Let's move to the **Broad Implementation** project type. Broad Implementation is very similar to last year, which was also called Broad Implementation. The key here is that you are building on previous documented evidence of a successful program or a successful line of research, and it is, thus, ready for broader implementation. With Broad Implementation, you are expanding the reach of a project, model, or tool. It could be expanding to a different age, a different geography, a different underrepresented or underserved group, etc. The plan for building knowledge is essential, as with all AISL projects moving forward. And how are you going to determine if this already successful project (resource, model, tool, or instrument) is effective with a broader audience?

The final type of project is **Conferences, Workshops, and Symposia**. In all cases, such proposals should seek to help meet program goals by building knowledge, advancing the field, developing the new research agendas, improving practice, etc. We highly encourage you to speech to a program officer before submitting one of these proposals.

Also, we have made a change in application timing. If your proposal request is for over $50,000, it must be submitted on the regular conference deadline, which is January 14th for this fiscal year and November 14th for Fiscal Year 15. If your proposal request is for under $50,000, it can be submitted at any time. We were asked why we made this change. And it's basically because we have limited funds, we want to consider all major investments at one time.

Bob Russell:
I'm now going to give an overview of actually putting together your proposal. How does one develop a competitive proposal? There's the program solicitation, which you should really review carefully, as we've already said. Another document that you'll want to refer to is called the Grant Proposal Guide (GPG), which guides all NSF proposals processes. The GPG has specific information about like font size, budget information, a variety of details about the practical aspects of and also the requirements in a proposal -- what you can do and what you can't do. So that's another essential document that you should refer to.

Ellen McCallie:
I think you'll be surprised at how useful it is. So if you've never taken a look, take a look at it.

Bob Russell:
In the program solicitation, we've estimated how many awards of the various types that Ellen just described that we anticipate awarding in Fiscal Year 2014. If the AISL funding level is similar, we're estimating that it'd be similar for 2015. We're not committed to funding this

many of each type, however. It's just that that's just how many we anticipated, based on previous submissions and review processes. It depends, however, on the range in competitiveness of what proposals we actually receive from the field.

There are actually several additional award mechanisms or grant mechanisms that are available across NSF, including our program. Some of these are called EAGER, RAPID, and CAREER. You can find more information about those opportunities in the Grant Proposal Guide and on the NSF website.

Submitting proposals: You can actually submit a proposal on grants.gov or NSF's Fastlane. With grants.gov, it's a two-stage process where you submit your proposal to grants.gov and then Fastlane picks it up. Fastlane is NSF's system. Be sure to note the Fastlane Help phone number, which is on the first page of the Fastlane website.

As with any electronic submissions, it always helps to start early. We would recommend that you start the submission process a week or more in advance to allow time to fix problems. There may be some detail you need to fix for your proposal to comply with requirements. You may have missed something or may need help from your SRO. Also, when you submit a proposal in Fastlane, there's a button that will check your proposal for compliance. And it'll tell you, if you missed answering any questions or you missed submitting any required documents. This can be very helpful.

There are a number of required sections of your proposal. And you can see the list in the Grant Proposal Guide in the program solicitation.

Project proposal: The first item in the first in the proposal is the project summary.

It's basically a one-page summary of the essence of your project. There are three text boxes that you'll have to fill in. One of those is the Overview. In the first sentence of the Overview, you have to identify the project type. Otherwise, your proposal may be returned without review. So include the project type in your first sentence. Then you provide an overview of the objectives, methods, intended impacts, and expected knowledge building from your project.

The next box is for Intellectual Merit. There you would discuss the Intellectual Merit of your project according to the criteria that we'll discuss a little bit later.

The third box is for Broader Impacts. Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts are the National Science Board review criteria for all NSF awards. We'll be covering the review criteria a little bit later in this presentation.

The core of your proposal is the project description, which is the narrative where you describe your project.

Ellen McCallie:
We're being a lot more prescriptive this year in terms of the project description. And I want to explain why. First, AISL supports knowledge-building. To fully document your project and

why it should be funded, we've defined sections we'd like you to label a number of sections. We're also being a lot more explicit about what needs to go in each section. We're doing this to help you build a strong case for your research and development project, so it's more likely to review well.

We've had enough projects that haven't been thorough enough or have missed certain sections, so they haven't reviewed as well as they might have. You don't have to answer every question under each section (or label); we include them to get you thinking about the information you may want to include in each section to make your case for funding your project.

Bob Russell:
You can see the major sections of the project description: project rationale, project design, et cetera. I'm going to say a little bit about each one of those sections.

The project rationale: Here you frame why your project is relevant and important by relating it to research literature and a review of program practice. This section establishes the foundation for your project and how your project builds on this knowledge and prior experience. In this section, it would also make sense for you to describe how your project, while it builds on this knowledge, is innovative and advances the field, whether that's in research or practice.

You should describe the STEM content of your project.

And then, if it's relevant, you may have been previously funded by NSF to do related work. If that's the case, you should review that work and how it informs the project that you're proposing.

Ellen McCallie:
You are not penalized if you haven't had prior NSF support. It's more that if you have had prior NSF support, have you done what you said you would do, what's the quality of that work, and how does it inform the current project you are proposing?

Bob Russell:
Next is project design, and that's where you describe what you want to do, including the project deliverables. If you're doing a research project, that would be to describe what research studies you're doing, what's the methodology, what's the sampling, and what's the analysis?

If you're doing a project where you're developing a learning environment, such as a new exhibit and resources, a youth program, a media -- multimedia, transmedia project, et cetera, you describe the specific learning components or resources that you're designing and how are you going to go about designing them. If your project has a specific focus on specific audiences, you may want to describe why you're selecting that audience, and in addition, how the resources that you're designing are appropriate for that audience. You may want to briefly refer back to the research and practice that you reviewed earlier.

You should consider making a case with respect to how this project will impact the field of informal STEM learning. How will the findings of this project be helpful to others? If you're developing a new informal learning environment or resource, how will it impact not just your

institution, but how will that influence exhibit design or after-school programming, or whatever the case might be?

And, it's great to build knowledge, but if nobody knows about it, what's the point? So you should have a strong dissemination plan. You can include some of the traditional ways of disseminating information as well as new and creative ones. You should try to incorporate as many of modes of dissemination as are practical to get the information out because the federal government is funding you to build knowledge about the field.

Additionally, there's a requirement that you share your evaluation reports and other products of your project on the CAISE website, informalscience.org, which is the resource website for the program. We'll discuss that a little bit more in detail just a little bit later.

Ellen McCallie:
Let's look at evaluation and external review. As many of you have noticed, this part of the solicitation has changed more than probably any other part.

Here's an overview for the rationale for having evaluation and external review. First, evaluation and external review processes are to ensure that projects get appropriate, rigorous input throughout the life of the project. You want appropriate, rigorous input throughout the life of the project so that the research and the development components of the project are actively improved.

The second part of evaluation and external review focuses on accountability. The federal government is funding you to enact a specific project. Did you end up addressing the project goals? What was the quality of your work? (That said, we recognize that your project will change along the way based on the experience of enacting the project and getting appropriate and rigorous input. At the same time, there are parameters for your funding--that's why you write a proposal in the first place.)

So a quick review, evaluation and external review are (1) to ensure your project is stronger because you're getting external, rigorous input, and (2) to ensure that there's accountability.

Now, there's a third component. All projects must build knowledge. They must advance the field. This can be done through research. It also can be done through evaluation serving as the knowledge building component. It also can be a hybrid of the two. There are as many permutations in terms of knowledge building with research and evaluation as there are proposals. Most critical is that each PI team figures out what makes sense to meet their project goals and include a clear design and description of an evaluation and an external review plan in their proposal.

If your knowledge building is through research, the research design would be included in the project design section of your proposal. If knowledge building is through evaluation, it would likely be described in the evaluation and external review section of the proposal.

Here are two concrete examples of thinking about evaluation and external review. The first example is with research. Let's say that you're proposing a project that has a research component. This could be a Research in Service to Practice project type; it could be a research component that is part of a Pathways proposal, it also could be part of a Broad Implementation or Innovation in Development proposal.

The point is that research components can be found in a number of project types. In such cases, you will need a mechanism to get independent, rigorous feedback with respect to, for example, how your theory and your methods align, how you collect and analyze your data, as well as how you interpret your findings. This external feedback may take the form of an advisory board with researchers, evaluators, practitioners, or it may take another form that specifically fits your project needs. In any case, the goal here is to make sure you get external feedback at multiple critical points in your project so that you end up with a stronger process and product.

If your project is primarily a research project, you will also need external feedback in terms of accountability: a short, coherent report of whether your project is meeting its goals, and what's the overall quality of your project. This can be done by the same advisory board, part of the advisory board, an evaluator, or again, some other external process that fits your specific project.

So far, for this example of knowledge building via research, we've talked about (1) an iterative process to get feedback, we've talked about (2) accountability, and then the third component is to make sure that there's a knowledge building component, so that would be (3) your research. Your research design, methods, analysis, design, et cetera, would be described in the project design section of the proposal. It wouldn't be included in the evaluation and external review.

Let's now take a development example. Again, we're going to go through the same components. (1) How do you get your iterative feedback, (2) your accountability, and then (3) your knowledge building?

Let's say you're proposing a project that has a significant development component. You will need a mechanism to get iterative feedback on the design and the implementation of your project. It may be a model, a resource, a tool, but in any case, starting at the conceptualization phase and continuing throughout, you will need some sort of front-end evaluation/formative evaluation process. It may occur through an internal evaluator, an external evaluator, or a team of advisors. The point is that there must be a process for you to get iterative feedback to improve the quality of your project.

Second, in terms of accountability, you'll need feedback with respect to whether or not your project is meeting its goal and what the quality of the project is. This would be from an external source such as an external evaluator or advisor.

Finally, you need a knowledge building component of your project. If your development project includes research, then the research outcomes are the knowledge building component. If your project seeks to build knowledge through evaluation processes, you'll need a summative

evaluation. It should answer questions you articulate as your knowledge building goals, such as what works for whom, under what circumstances, or the like.

We can't repeat enough: As all projects are different, we ask that you think about what works in terms of the design of the evaluation and external review that makes the most sense for your particular project. We ask that you make the best case you can for what you are doing and why you're doing it, including what difference will it make to the field. Overall, this section needs to describe (1) iterative improvement cycles, (2) accountability, and (3) there needs to be knowledge building, which will be included in this section if it is evaluation. If (3) is by research, then the description would likely fit better in the project design. But again, this is up to the PI team.

This also brings up that NSF does not have a definition of research or evaluation. We know the field doesn't have clear definitions separating research and evaluation. Our field uses both terms. Many of the evaluators use research methods, and researchers use what are often considered evaluation methods. Thus, the reason NSF doesn't include definitions is that there aren't generally accepted definitions. We use both terms because both terms are used by the informal STEM education field for knowledge building.

Bob Russell:
I think just a point on research and evaluation: There's no cookie cutter approach that we're asking you to do. I think Ellen's point was that you develop a research and/or evaluation plan that suits your specific project taking into account some of the key points that Ellen made, but there's no automatic approach that's the right approach.

Management plan: Hopefully in your proposal you've convinced people that you've got a great idea and that you've got a great plan for carrying it out. Then you have to also convince reviewers that you have people on your team that know what they're doing so that they can implement the project effectively. In your management plan, you should describe your project leadership team, the PI, and if you have co-PIs, and other key members of the senior management.

Note that in each of the project type descriptions, we're asking for both expertise in practice and in knowledge building as part of the PI team. So if you're doing Research in Service to Practice, you've got to have a practitioner on board that's integrally involved. If you're proposing an Innovation in Development project, you need either a researcher or an evaluator that's part of your PI team. But it's even broader than that. Overall, you need to demonstrate that the diverse expertise you need to carry out the project is directly involved or available to you.

You should also describe how they're going to work together. What is the management plan? If you have a collaborative project, for example, what's the role of the lead institution and what are the roles of the collaborating institutions, and how will they work together? What processes will you use for them to work together?

You should have a work plan and task and timeline. There are different formats you can use for that. But reviewers always like to know how the project is going to roll out, what are the key milestones, and so forth.

And I'd just like to add a kind of an overall comment on how your project description works. Everything's linked together. Your rationale builds the case for why you're doing the project and the way you're doing it. The project design discusses the project deliverables and how you will go about them, whether a research plan or developing specific educational components.

Then you describe a process for improvement and accountability that should link directly with the original goals, as well as clarify the knowledge building component of your project.

Finally, you've describe the management team, and they should have knowledge to implement the project effectively.

The point is the whole proposal comes together. It's not like you have three or four separate parts of a proposal that are freestanding and that don't relate to one another. They should just build on each other.

Key points: In your project narrative, you should put all the essential information that you believe a reviewer should know in the 15 page narrative (project description), because, while reviewers are encouraged to review the other materials in the proposal, the focus is on the project description. So put all your essentials in the 15 pages.

There are several supplementary documents that you're required to submit, such as a data management plan and a post-doc mentoring plan, if applicable. These are described in the Grant Proposal Guide.

You can also include some additional documents that are not required: letters of commitment, summaries of prior evaluation results, among others. There are some limitations on the number of pages, so check the solicitation.

In terms of budget, the amount you ask for should be consistent with the level of work. For senior personnel, there's a limit of two months' salary, unless you provide a justification.

The indirect cost rate is set by your institution in conjunction with a federal agency. These costs keep the lights on, the building open, et cetera. Indirect costs cannot be included in direct costs. You should include your full indirect cost rate, and there is no cost sharing.

There are expenses that you shouldn't ask for. The Grant Proposal Guide provides a lot more detail in terms of budget.

The Review Process: This is what happens after NSF receives your proposal. You get three or four reviews from a panel of your peers, from scientists to evaluators, researchers, practitioners, et cetera.

We group proposals that are similar, and then we get a panel to review them. The panel then recommends proposals to us by rating them as highly competitive, competitive, or not competitive; this is advisory to NSF. Program officers then discuss and try to agree on what proposals overall should be recommended for funding. Unfortunately, the number of strong proposals usually outnumbers the amount of funding we have. We also are looking to fund diverse portfolio. One thing to note is the PIs will receive the reviews, the panel summaries, and comments from the program officers. We are mandated by Congress to respond to 70 percent of the proposals within six months.

In terms of the merit review criteria, in January 2013, the NSF came out with five Merit Review Criteria for both Intellectual Merit and Broader Impact. These are the same five questions for both of the merit review criteria. Thus, NSF is very transparent about the review criteria. We encourage you to have one of your peers, someone in your department, someone in your institution, or a colleague, to read your proposal with these criteria in hand for both intellectual merit and broader impact. This way you can get feedback before you even turn in your proposal.

Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development
I want to mention the Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development. We'll be talking more about these guidelines in the Webinar 102.

But we're mentioning the Common Guidelines because this publication is a joint effort between the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education. Its overall goal is to improve the quality and increase pace of findings from education research and development. In terms of the current AISL solicitation, we are beginning to adopt language from the Common Guidelines.

Next, I can't emphasize this resource enough: CAISE, the Center for Advancement for Informal Science Education, and InformalScience.org, CAISE's redesigned website. You'll notice that there is an AISL page for potential PIs. There're a lot of evaluation resources. Many of the things that you may be looking for, including the references that you find on page 6 in the solicitation, are on InformalScience.org. Take a look at this slide when you have more time.

Finally, NSF has resources for PIs. We highly encourage you to look to see what AISL has already funded. There's a link here. There're other ways to search, and the grant proposal guide is a very helpful resource, including FAQs.

Bob Russell:
Final suggestions: Submit early so you aren't hampered by technical problems; our deadlines are firm. Please read your project narrative of your proposal for grammatical, spelling, and punctuation errors. Think about it: Would you as a reviewer wonder if the proposers were competent in delivering a $2 million project, if there were many spelling and other errors in the proposal?

Program officers are willing to help, but do your homework and prepare well before contacting us. Read the solicitation several times. Figure out what you'd like to propose. Contact us at DRLAISL@nsf.gov.

After submission, if your proposal does get good reviews, you may be contacted by a program officer with questions about your project. So please treat those questions seriously because those responses may affect whether or not your project is recommended for funding.

Two final points: First, we need reviewers, so if you're interested in being on a grant review panel, please send a note to us at DRLAISL@nsf.gov. Please include a CV or resume as well as your areas of expertise. If you are a PI on a project or have a significant role in a project that will be submitted for the upcoming deadline, then you would not be eligible to be a reviewer for the program your submitting to. There are multiple programs, however. Consider reviewing for another DRL program.

Second, in NSF's Division of Research on Learning and in other divisions, there are a number of other programs that you might be interested in that support research, development of assessment tools, development of other program resources for informal STEM settings. There are a few slides there that highlight some of those other programs that you can check out.

We'll now move to questions.

[All the questions from Webinars are compiled in a separate document.]