WEBVTT

1
00:00:16.080 --> 00:00:22.590
Vishal Sharma: hi everyone, thank you for joining us today for the civic innovation challenge programs perspective kind of list webinar.

2
00:00:23.730 --> 00:00:30.300
Vishal Sharma: We will begin the webinar shortly in about a couple minutes we'll just give people time to join in, and once.

3
00:00:31.440 --> 00:00:36.420
Vishal Sharma: couple Minutes have passed we'll get the presentation started and again, thank you for joining us.

4
00:02:16.170 --> 00:02:23.100
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: hi everyone, we want to thank you for joining us today for the civic innovation challenge prospective panelists webinar.

5
00:02:23.400 --> 00:02:32.610
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: My name is me files EVAL and i'm a program director at the National Science Foundation and part of the program team for the civic innovation challenge or civic for short.

6
00:02:33.120 --> 00:02:41.460
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Civic, as you probably know, is a research and action competition, led by nsf and partnership with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Energy.

7
00:02:41.970 --> 00:02:51.780
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We also have a cooperative agreement with metalab network who leads the development of a Community of practice for the awardees as well as aspects of outreach and publicity for the Program.

8
00:02:52.500 --> 00:03:02.280
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: This webinar will provide a background on the civic program in the context of the nsf merit review and selection process and what is involved in serving on a merit review panel.

9
00:03:02.970 --> 00:03:10.500
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Many of you have already completed our perspective panelists questionnaire and we sincerely appreciate your willingness to volunteer as reviewers.

10
00:03:10.770 --> 00:03:17.760
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: For those who have not yet signed up and we're interested we if we are about to paste the link to the question here in the chat.

11
00:03:18.210 --> 00:03:27.300
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We expect to start holding panels, the first week in June and will be recruiting panelists primarily from those who respond to our questionnaire starting around April 25.

12
00:03:27.930 --> 00:03:35.430
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We will need reviewers from the range of sectors, who are part of civic proposals, especially those with on ground experience working in and with communities.

13
00:03:35.640 --> 00:03:43.860
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So if you're from local county or state government industry or nonprofit organizations, please consider signing up and serving as a reviewer.

14
00:03:44.100 --> 00:03:51.000
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Your perspectives are vital for this program and complement the expertise from across the academic community, you will also serve on the panels.

15
00:03:51.900 --> 00:04:00.300
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Following the webinar will have an opportunity for Q amp a but while we're going through the webinar we encourage you to post your questions, through the zoom Q amp a function.

16
00:04:02.400 --> 00:04:13.530
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So here's the agenda for today's webinar will begin with a brief overview of serving on an nsf panel will then introduce the key aspects of a civic program followed by an overview of the solicitation.

17
00:04:13.950 --> 00:04:26.190
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: will then highlight what to focus on when reviewing civic proposals will then discuss the panel process of preparing and submitting individual reviews and the panel outputs will conclude with Q amp a with members of the civic program team.

18
00:04:26.850 --> 00:04:36.810
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: If you heard our program webinar, you will find that parts two and three of this webinar cover content presented there, but please bear with us as the other parts of the webinar will be new content.

19
00:04:37.560 --> 00:04:45.660
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So let's get started with a brief introduction to serving on an nsf panel, there are two primary objectives of an nsf panel.

20
00:04:46.110 --> 00:04:57.090
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: First, is to provide feedback to the p eyes and their proposal so that they can hear from an objective set of reviewers what aspects of their project ideas align well with the program and nsf goals and what may need to be improved.

21
00:04:57.780 --> 00:05:07.080
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Second, is to provide advice to the nsf program directors, regarding which proposals to recommend for funding through the program you can see here on the next slide.

22
00:05:09.720 --> 00:05:14.400
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We go to the next slide there a summary of the typical time commitment for service on panels.

23
00:05:15.030 --> 00:05:20.910
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: panelists will receive between six to eight proposals to review reviewers typically spend.

24
00:05:21.300 --> 00:05:33.330
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: around an hour so for proposal at some point in the two weeks prior to the panel and will be asking reviewers to submit their individual reviews for each proposal at least three days prior to the start of the panel.

25
00:05:34.290 --> 00:05:43.290
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The first day of the panel will typically run from 10am to 5pm Eastern time and the second day from around 10am to 2:30pm Eastern time.

26
00:05:43.740 --> 00:05:51.630
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The first day will begin with some general logistics and reminders about the general process, and most of the time is dedicated to discussions about the proposals.

27
00:05:52.050 --> 00:05:59.670
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Each panelist will be assigned around two proposals for which to prepare a panel summary that will be submitted prior to the start of the second day of the panel.

28
00:06:00.210 --> 00:06:07.590
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: panelists are sometimes able to work on these during the first day but often need to complete their some reason the evening or in the morning, prior to the start of the second day.

29
00:06:08.280 --> 00:06:17.730
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The second day of the panel typically begins with finalizing panel rankings of the proposals which is followed by reading and reviewing panel summaries will speak about all of that little bit more later.

30
00:06:18.240 --> 00:06:24.360
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: To ensure integrity and fairness in the review process and FF follows a set of conflict of interest rules.

31
00:06:24.600 --> 00:06:32.880
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: That are meant to remove or limit the appearance of influence of ties to an investigator or institution that could affect the advice provided by reviewers.

32
00:06:33.300 --> 00:06:38.490
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Are viewers will be asked to review the standard conflict of interest guidance for the proposals are assigned.

33
00:06:38.730 --> 00:06:47.100

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: find a conflict of interest form and we asked for viewers with conflicts of interest to step out of discussions, when the conflict proposals are being discussed during panels.

34
00:06:47.580 --> 00:06:58.740
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The other piece to note is that if you are proposing to the civic program you will not be eligible to serve on the Panel for that track that you are submitting to so, for instance, if you're submitting to track a.

35
00:06:59.160 --> 00:07:12.240
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: living in a changing climate, you cannot serve on a panel for this track and review proposals for it, however, you will be eligible, or you are eligible to serve in a panel and review proposals for track and vice versa, we also want to note.

36
00:07:13.440 --> 00:07:23.250
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: On the that the process and results from nsf panels are confidential panelists are not allowed to disclose disclose the identities of anyone on the panel.

37
00:07:23.940 --> 00:07:33.510
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Including in their reviews they're not allowed to discuss anything related to the set of proposals on their panel or their associated recommendations with anyone outside their panel.

38
00:07:33.780 --> 00:07:42.090
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And they can only discuss this content with others on the panel during the set panel X, so we will now start with a brief overview of the civic Program.

39
00:07:42.810 --> 00:07:54.660
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The central goal of the civic innovation challenge is to accelerate the transition to practice a foundation research and emerging technologies into local government and Community organizations through civic engaged research.

40
00:07:55.050 --> 00:08:08.910
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The program asks communities to be in the lead of identifying priorities and challenges that are ripe for innovation and to partner with researchers to co develop and pilot potential solutions over a rapid 12 months timeframe, following a six month planning period.

41
00:08:09.990 --> 00:08:21.720
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The program strives to support ideas that can be scaled within their pilot communities sustained beyond the nsf award and have the potential to be transferred to other communities across the US.

42
00:08:22.200 --> 00:08:36.090
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And lastly, the program emphasizes support of projects that involve stakeholders and individuals on the front lines of these Community challenges, including those who have historically not been sufficiently involved as Co creators and research and innovation activities.

43
00:08:37.410 --> 00:08:43.740
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So this next slide provides a high level overview of how the program works and your role in it as essential panelists.

44
00:08:44.400 --> 00:08:57.420
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Each civic solicitation has two tracks centered around focus themes that were developed with input from communities across the US, together with consideration of the priority areas of the federal agency co founders for the Program.

45
00:08:58.530 --> 00:09:02.610
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: After the submission deadline proposals are reviewed by panels of experts.

46
00:09:03.240 --> 00:09:13.500
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Using nsf merit review process that considers intellectual merit and broader impacts, as well as criteria specific to the program goals, all of which will speak about a little bit later in the webinar.

47
00:09:14.280 --> 00:09:22.320
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: I want to emphasize again that we strive to build panels that reflect program goals and a strong emphasis on meaningful civic participation and Community impact.

48
00:09:22.590 --> 00:09:27.210
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We do this by ensuring that the reviewers for proposals cover the range of academic disciplines.

49
00:09:27.420 --> 00:09:38.220
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: represented in the proposals and equally important that we include reviewers with experience and local county and state government and Community organizations, as well as industry, where relevant.

50
00:09:38.880 --> 00:09:47.430
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The panel's make funding recommendations to nsf and then the nsf civic program team, together with Julian DHS make the final funding recommendations.

51
00:09:47.940 --> 00:09:55.050
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: As we noted earlier, the program includes two stages and today's webinar will cover the review process for Stage one proposals only.

52
00:09:55.860 --> 00:10:08.670
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In stage one awarded teams receive planning grants of up to $50,000 to undertake planning activities over a six month period during which they were find their proposals strengthen the partnerships and prepared the submission for stage to.

53
00:10:09.450 --> 00:10:14.370
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: As a side note only awardees from Stage one will be eligible to submit proposals to stage to.

54
00:10:15.120 --> 00:10:21.390
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Stage two awards are for up to $1 million to execute their pilot projects over the rapid 12 month timeframe.

55
00:10:22.290 --> 00:10:32.670
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: During those stages awardees interact with specific program team and also participate in Community of practice activities in depth, building a nationwide network of knowledge sharing between the civic team's.

56
00:10:33.900 --> 00:10:50.040
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: perspective or viewers may find it helpful to learn about the types of projects funded by civic and the first round of the program and the ongoing work of these awarded teams to do so, we encourage you to visit the website noted on the slide that metro lab manages and SF civic innovation.org.

57
00:10:51.180 --> 00:11:01.410
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And the civic awards tab you'll find project videos websites and one page descriptions of each project, where you can also see the Multi organizational partners who are involved in each project.

58
00:11:02.070 --> 00:11:11.520
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: You can see from this map that the teams are located across the US from cities like Atlanta in Los Angeles to rural communities in Michigan and Florida, and the prevalence of new Mexico and many others.

59
00:11:11.970 --> 00:11:24.180
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In our first round the solicitation which had the track themes of mobility and resilience to natural disasters 52 teams were selected for Stage one awards and 17 of those teams were selected for Stage two.

60
00:11:26.010 --> 00:11:33.840
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: You can see here the program team for civic which includes members across the for participating nsf directorates computer and information science and engineering.

61
00:11:34.200 --> 00:11:38.940
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Engineering Directorate geosciences and social behavioral and economic sciences.

62
00:11:39.570 --> 00:11:49.980
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Within DHS and includes numbers from the Directorate for science and technology, and also the Federal Emergency Management Agency or female, and within do we from the vehicle technology office.

63
00:11:50.580 --> 00:12:02.670
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: As well as metro lab network as we noted earlier, the merit review process is led by nsf do we and DHS provide input on the final selection of proposals to recommend for funding following the external review process.

64
00:12:03.060 --> 00:12:08.670

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And metro lab network does not participate in any way in the merit review or proposal selection process.

65
00:12:10.380 --> 00:12:14.190
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Now we're going to review some details of the current civic solicitation.

66
00:12:15.630 --> 00:12:29.490
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: For this round of the solicitation Stage one planning proposals will be submitted by May 5 2022 we anticipate making up to 50 Stage one awards with expected start date for projects by October 2022.

67
00:12:30.150 --> 00:12:41.190
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Stage one awardees will submit proposals for Stage two in February 2023 and we expect to make up to 20 stage two awards with project, starting by October 2023.

68
00:12:42.840 --> 00:12:47.370
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Okay, so now will briefly go over the descriptions of the two tracks for this round.

69
00:12:48.120 --> 00:12:55.320
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The full descriptions for these track can be found in section two a of the solicitation if you would like to see that here we'll just highlight some parts.

70
00:12:55.650 --> 00:13:05.250
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So tracking for this round is focused on adaptation mitigation and resilience and Community systems services and economic drivers that are vulnerable in the face of changing climate.

71
00:13:05.850 --> 00:13:11.010
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: projects will focus on aspects of central for the proper functioning of the Community and its economy.

72
00:13:11.460 --> 00:13:22.860
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: such as access to digital infrastructure and services, public utilities Food and Agriculture ecosystem services residential and commercial buildings and education and workforce development.

73
00:13:23.250 --> 00:13:28.620
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: These are examples given to proposers, and this is not an exhaustive list, so there could very well be many others.

74
00:13:29.040 --> 00:13:33.510
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Additionally, as teams are formulating their ideas and pursuing partnerships within their communities.

75
00:13:33.960 --> 00:13:44.850
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: They are asked to consider the perspective of economically disadvantaged and marginalized populations that are especially susceptible to increasing environmental instability and its resulting impacts.

76
00:13:45.990 --> 00:13:52.410
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: On this slide you can also see questions that were provided in the solicitation to assist teams and formulating their topic areas.

77
00:13:53.700 --> 00:13:55.860
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The other track for this round track be.

78
00:13:57.750 --> 00:13:58.710
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In the next slide.

79
00:14:03.270 --> 00:14:07.680
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: deck if we can go there, we go is focused on enhancing people's access.

80
00:14:07.950 --> 00:14:18.000
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: To essential resources and services such as food, housing, broadband and mobile technologies for better accessibility could significantly improve quality of life and Community resilience.

81
00:14:18.480 --> 00:14:32.760

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Projects may consider gaps in equities in resource and service allocation resulting from a variety of reasons, including long standing systemic issues around accessibility economic disparities or disruptions caused by a shocker disaster.

82
00:14:33.360 --> 00:14:42.150
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: For this track proposers are encouraged to leverage anchor institutions in their community that are focused on delivering or providing access to one or more resources.

83
00:14:42.420 --> 00:14:51.930
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: or services to a set of end users, which may include socio economically disadvantaged groups and vulnerable populations, such as the elderly and those who are physically impaired.

84
00:14:52.320 --> 00:14:59.970
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Again on this slide you can see examples of questions that were provided in the solicitation to assist teams and formulating their topic areas for this track.

85
00:15:01.650 --> 00:15:10.740
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Note the proposals must include all sections required in the nsf proposal, in a word, policies and procedures guide, also known as the PA PG.

86
00:15:11.310 --> 00:15:15.630
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Well, ask reviewers to focus on the following sections in particular.

87
00:15:16.560 --> 00:15:24.060
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The first is the project summary which briefly describes the main objectives intellectual merit and broader impacts of the proposal and one page.

88
00:15:24.660 --> 00:15:33.000
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The project description, which is the intellectual core of the proposal and describes the narrative of what the team is proposing to carry it out and how they'll do it.

89
00:15:33.750 --> 00:15:37.530
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The sub section on facilities equipment and other resources.

90

00:15:38.190 --> 00:15:50.940
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: which may describe further information about facilities and resources available to the team, including physical and personnel and can also include evidence of unfunded collaborations and password between partners.

91
00:15:51.480 --> 00:15:57.870
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The data management plan which will describe what data will be generated and cover plans related to access and archiving.

92
00:15:58.530 --> 00:16:12.690
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Bio sketches of the projects personnel and letters of collaboration, some of which may be the nsf standard letter and others may include more details about the collaboration, as this is allowed for the program to not just use the standard nsf letter.

93
00:16:15.240 --> 00:16:22.620
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So now i'm going to say a little bit more about the project description section, which is a section you'll be paying closest attention to as a reviewer.

94
00:16:23.070 --> 00:16:27.990
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: This section has to required components, the first is the vision for a research.

95
00:16:28.320 --> 00:16:41.610
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: centered pilot project, which is where teams will outline the vision and goals of the pilot project that would be carried out within a real world context in Stage two and the tasks to be performed during the stage one planning grant.

96
00:16:42.450 --> 00:16:51.450
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We want to emphasize that the envisioned pilot project must go beyond a model policy best practice or design document or academic publication.

97
00:16:52.500 --> 00:17:07.170
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: They can include these aspects as components of a stage to pilot project, but the pilot should include a piece that's focused on experimentation testing maybe along the lines of rapid prototyping and refining a proposed solution in and with the Community.

98

00:17:08.550 --> 00:17:21.240
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: This section should also include a sub section called research questions that was detailed technical and social science questions hypotheses and research gaps that will be explored during the planning process in order to refine the stage to pilot project.

99
00:17:21.720 --> 00:17:27.960
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We also included in the solicitation a list of questions for teams to consider as they put together this part of the project idea.

100
00:17:28.800 --> 00:17:36.570
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So these are questions, such as in what way does the envision stage to pilot project will be on the seat of practice and state of the art.

101
00:17:36.900 --> 00:17:43.440
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Very important questions here will the research questions addressed in the planning phase, strengthen the stage to pilot project.

102
00:17:43.740 --> 00:17:55.410
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Is the envision stage to pilot project suitable for the fast paced timeline of the civic program and budget of the program as well as being able to start at the within the the short time frame of the Program.

103
00:17:55.890 --> 00:18:05.970
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Well, the activities undertaken during the planning phase prepare the team to propose a competitive stage to full award so they really thinking about how they're going to use their stage and awards to prepare them for stage to.

104
00:18:07.080 --> 00:18:09.510
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: The other required section and the project description.

105
00:18:09.810 --> 00:18:17.010
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: is called civic partnerships and engagement this section must describe the Community where the piloting activities will be undertaken.

106
00:18:17.190 --> 00:18:25.290

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And detail how the team of civic and academic partners will work together to close the loop and achieve significant impact with their proposed activities.

107
00:18:25.740 --> 00:18:29.940
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And SF expect strong collaboration across the planning grant team.

108
00:18:30.510 --> 00:18:40.950
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In this section details of the collaboration should be included, including both previous partnerships engagement and the specific proposed roles and responsibilities of the partners involved in this project.

109
00:18:41.280 --> 00:18:49.560
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: here to we've included the list of questions that we asked him to consider in the solicitation these are who from the Community should be engaged in the project.

110
00:18:50.070 --> 00:19:00.540
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: How will be approach to collaboration break down barriers between the different sectors, academics, civic organizations local and state government to achieve the impact that is desired.

111
00:19:00.990 --> 00:19:09.660
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And the community's perspective to the proposed activities address a problem of significance that is a very key piece of this program if this is something that's Community really wants.

112
00:19:10.350 --> 00:19:21.090
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In what ways has the Community work to address this problem previously and why does the Community believe this problem will benefit from the inclusion of researchers, also a really important piece to consider for this.

113
00:19:21.930 --> 00:19:28.050
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: For this review does the team have the capacity to undertake a fast paced research Center pilot project and stage two.

114
00:19:28.620 --> 00:19:40.620

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And is there a need for skill building workforce development in order for the Community to be an integral part of the pilot project so i'll now hand it over to my colleague, David corman to complete the remainder of the webinar.

115
00:19:51.570 --> 00:19:52.080
There we go.

116
00:19:53.250 --> 00:19:57.870
David Corman: Thank you McCall now, we will discuss how to review civic proposals.

117
00:19:58.350 --> 00:20:20.340
David Corman: We want to emphasize again that civic proposals are not your typical nsf proposals and must be reviewed within the content of the civic program goals, scope and award sizes, that is six month planning grant at $50,000 and 12 months stage two awards up to $1 million.

118
00:20:21.360 --> 00:20:22.470
David Corman: Go to the next slide.

119
00:20:26.880 --> 00:20:36.750
David Corman: Civic proposals will be evaluated for their intellectual merit and broader impacts using nsf general merit review process.

120
00:20:37.800 --> 00:20:47.790
David Corman: nsf you know actual America criteria encompasses the potential for a project to advance knowledge and the broader impacts criteria.

121
00:20:48.330 --> 00:20:57.360
David Corman: encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific desired societal outcome.

122
00:20:58.050 --> 00:21:08.460
David Corman: This slide list some of the standard nsf questions for evaluating proposals for intellectual merit and broader impact for planning grants consider especially.

123

00:21:09.210 --> 00:21:20.280
David Corman: The vision laid out in the proposal, the team has the team has been described, including the extent of civic partnerships identified.

124
00:21:20.790 --> 00:21:28.740
David Corman: And the potential impact of a pilot on the Community, including active participation by civic partners.

125
00:21:29.310 --> 00:21:39.570
David Corman: proposers may want to think, from the perspective of panelists who may ask questions such as those described above, but more succinctly stated.

126
00:21:40.050 --> 00:22:01.500
David Corman: For example, is the vision of the proposed pilot attractive and creative what will be the societal impact if a pilot is accomplished or the planning activities clear what is the Community and are the civic partners really partners or just potential recipients of research activities.

127
00:22:02.640 --> 00:22:12.540
David Corman: 10 key elements of the vision, the achieve to show impact of the pilot within with a civic partners in the 12 months of Stage two.

128
00:22:13.260 --> 00:22:22.380
David Corman: Additionally, we asked you to consider the solicitation guidance that we shared earlier in this presentation by the project discuss.

129
00:22:22.980 --> 00:22:34.260
David Corman: description sections titled vision for a centered research centered pilot project and civic partnership and engagement when assessing proposals for both criteria.

130
00:22:37.080 --> 00:22:50.310
David Corman: Along with general nsf merit review criteria, there are also additional specific solicitation review criteria which evaluates proposals for the relevance, the goals of the Program.

131
00:22:51.330 --> 00:23:00.660

David Corman: The criteria includes the following questions is it evident that the civic project is addressing a Community identified priority.

132
00:23:01.170 --> 00:23:12.480
David Corman: With a pilot that has the potential to be scaled and sustained is it driven by strong partnerships between the necessary side of say that organizations.

133
00:23:12.870 --> 00:23:35.850
David Corman: Local and state governments, researchers and other partners and stakeholders and, finally, is the proposed research pilot project well suited for executing in the fast paced 12 month time frame of the civic program, including the need for a rapid startup at the onset of stage to.

134
00:23:37.200 --> 00:23:38.400
David Corman: Go the next slide.

135
00:23:39.570 --> 00:23:50.910
David Corman: Over the next few slides will review the panel process and outputs from panels, first of all keep in mind the objectives of the panel and their review process are.

136
00:23:51.330 --> 00:24:03.300
David Corman: To provide quality feedback to the p eyes and provide advice to National Science Foundation program directors for funding recommendations to the next.

137
00:24:04.290 --> 00:24:16.110
David Corman: This slide on implicit bias is to serve as a reminder that reviews should reflect the content of the proposal and must be based solely on the merits of the proposal.

138
00:24:18.870 --> 00:24:29.190
David Corman: And this slide we provide some quick mechanics that uploading individual reviews viewing them during panels and also uploading panel summons.

139
00:24:30.390 --> 00:24:43.410
David Corman: And SF uses a fast lane system for uploading reviews and individuals who volunteers for viewers will receive a letter granting them fast lane access and providing further instructions.

140
00:24:44.940 --> 00:25:01.770
David Corman: fast lane is not the simplest system you use you'll enter your booze by first selecting the proposal review tab and the main fast line menu one point, make sure you submit your themes, not simply safe and.

141
00:25:02.940 --> 00:25:15.150
David Corman: You can update your reviews and your ratings during the panel process Please submit your reviews as Michael mentioned at least three days before the panel started.

142
00:25:16.380 --> 00:25:28.140
David Corman: And if that will also provide reviewers with a template for writing the reviews and panel summaries, and we ask that you use a text editor like Microsoft word for writing them.

143
00:25:28.920 --> 00:25:41.610
David Corman: Once reviews are ready you'll submit them to pass sign during the panels you all again log into fast lane and use the panelists functions tab on the main fast sliding menu.

144
00:25:42.030 --> 00:25:55.920
David Corman: Where you should be able to see your reviews and when a able, by nsf the reviews from your peers on the panel, and this is also where you will submit panel summaries go to the next slide.

145
00:25:57.390 --> 00:26:08.070
David Corman: Guided by the written evaluation reviewers assign a rating to each of their individual with us that can range from he for excellent to P for poor.

146
00:26:08.940 --> 00:26:24.090
David Corman: proposals can be rated E they very good tea good, fair at the poor and reviewers can also assign half scores example the slashing.

147
00:26:24.960 --> 00:26:40.830
David Corman: These ratings can be considered analogous to grades typically assigned in a class is equivalent to a he equivalent to a B G equivalent to a C F equivalent to a D amp D equivalent to that.

148
00:26:41.910 --> 00:27:00.600
David Corman: Please note that she is good but doesn't mean great well gee according to fascinating maybe a quality proposal worthy of support it's instructive to note that proposals with many teams are seldom funding.

149
00:27:04.110 --> 00:27:15.090
David Corman: panelists may agree not to discuss proposals that receive uniformly unenthusiastic reviews the triage decision to not discuss the proposal.

150
00:27:15.570 --> 00:27:30.600
David Corman: will be based on unanimous consent by the panel, including program directors, please note that a proposal is not a triage candidate if it has at least one rating above g.

151
00:27:33.420 --> 00:27:38.400
David Corman: And for any proposal that is discussed panel summaries will be prepared.

152
00:27:40.380 --> 00:27:51.930
David Corman: On the discussion of a proposal and assign panelists as needed a scribe will prepare a summary that tells the story of how the proposal ended up where it did.

153
00:27:52.230 --> 00:28:05.310
David Corman: Based on the panels discussion of its intellectual merit and broader impacts and if the proposal sufficiently well address the solicitation specific review criteria.

154
00:28:06.210 --> 00:28:24.300
David Corman: Analysts will be provided a template by nsf on how to write the summary ahead of the panel it's important that the panel summary make the case for the panel's recommendation of the proposal and that it avoids cutting and pasting from individual reviews.

155
00:28:25.500 --> 00:28:41.160
David Corman: proposers will always receive anonymize copies of reviews that have been submitted, and as long as that proposal has not been triage an anonymized animal summary.

156
00:28:42.420 --> 00:28:56.730

David Corman: Animal summary should capture and address the major strengths and weaknesses of our proposal at a higher level and leave lower level issues to the individual is that's the point that's worth.

157
00:28:58.230 --> 00:29:16.980
David Corman: worth restating panel summaries are there to address major strengths and weaknesses spanning the intellectual merit and broader impact of the proposals, lower level things long in the individual reviews, which are made available to the.

158
00:29:18.120 --> 00:29:19.050
David Corman: To the proposal.

159
00:29:20.070 --> 00:29:28.710
David Corman: or a given panel or given proposal based on the individual reviews and the panel discussion about the merits of proposal.

160
00:29:29.310 --> 00:29:43.260
David Corman: panels will provide nsf with a recommendation, using the following categories highly competitive, which is a strong research pilot project potential for significant Community impact.

161
00:29:44.400 --> 00:29:54.480
David Corman: When you give something a highly competitive rate and you're telling nsf that's among your highest priority of consideration for funding.

162
00:29:55.260 --> 00:30:11.490
David Corman: The next lower one competitive solid research pilot project plans consider funding if funds are available low competitive means elements of the project are worthy of support.

163
00:30:12.090 --> 00:30:30.810
David Corman: But addressing the weakness would require significant changes in the proposal not competitive means the project idea requires significant rethinking as it fails to meet one or more criteria, for example, the scope may be too large for.

164
00:30:32.220 --> 00:30:32.670

David Corman: The.

165
00:30:33.870 --> 00:30:49.380
David Corman: For the Espace Stage one and stage two activities, the scale may be too large or too small, the vision may be incomplete or the partnerships, maybe not well described.

166
00:30:50.880 --> 00:30:55.500
David Corman: Finally, if the project has been if the proposal has been triage.

167
00:30:56.610 --> 00:31:20.340
David Corman: it's receives a writing have not discussed in panel final note panels recommendations are advisory to nsf and nsf program team will balance those recommendations, along with other issues, as it makes final funding.

168
00:31:21.450 --> 00:31:22.260
decisions.

169
00:31:25.650 --> 00:31:36.450
David Corman: Go this last slide so recording event will be made available in the fall in the coming days, if you want to learn more about the Program.

170
00:31:38.250 --> 00:32:02.340
David Corman: check out nsf civic innovation.org which a lot, which provides both access to the solicitation provides links to past webinars q&a sessions and, frankly, give some great information about past and ongoing civic awards, including.

171
00:32:03.420 --> 00:32:13.320
David Corman: This including a set of videos provided by awardees along with specific information on.

172
00:32:14.640 --> 00:32:21.120
David Corman: Stage two awards, as well as a comprehensive set of frequently asked questions.

173
00:32:25.980 --> 00:32:32.640
David Corman: i'll now hand it over to the Shell Sharma to facilitate questions and answers.

174
00:32:41.340 --> 00:32:48.000
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, David and the call for the webinar presentation folks if you haven't had the chance to do so, yet.

175
00:32:49.260 --> 00:32:57.690
Vishal Sharma: You can post your questions to the civic program P to zoom's Q amp a function at the bottom of the zoom application.

176
00:32:58.320 --> 00:33:12.330
Vishal Sharma: we've had a few questions come in already so we'll get the Q amp a started now, I also want to introduce Dr jojo fan who's also part of specific program P and it's available here today with us, to answer your questions as well.

177
00:33:14.760 --> 00:33:16.500
Vishal Sharma: So first question.

178
00:33:18.090 --> 00:33:30.780
Vishal Sharma: i'll direct this to you, David for the project description our teams only allowed to include those four sections mentioned in the solicitation or can they have other section headers as well.

179
00:33:32.490 --> 00:33:45.120
David Corman: As a minimum, you need those four sections you remember also you only have seven pages and the project description description and that's exclusive of references.

180
00:33:45.750 --> 00:34:03.060
David Corman: But you can have you can create other subsection other sections of Sub sections within the project description, but we wanted to be able to see and panelists want to be able to find those specific sections.

181
00:34:04.590 --> 00:34:08.760
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, David next question i'll direct you yo yo.

182
00:34:10.050 --> 00:34:15.930

Vishal Sharma: yo yo can academic institutions lead the proposal or Community partners have to be.

183
00:34:17.790 --> 00:34:24.060
Yueyue Fan: A comic yeah academic teams that can lead at the proposal as the leading P eyes.

184
00:34:25.200 --> 00:34:40.440
Yueyue Fan: And when we say that proposal has the eye problem that has to be Community oriented and identified doesn't mean the pci or the pci institution submission institution has to be the Community.

185
00:34:41.370 --> 00:34:47.130
David Corman: So when we augment that answer if you're a an NGO.

186
00:34:48.180 --> 00:34:57.420
David Corman: You can non governmental nonprofit you can also lead the proposal with the academic partners supporting it.

187
00:34:58.830 --> 00:35:10.410
David Corman: yeah what you should think about is what will make the submission easiest for you to do, and I say that, in part because.

188
00:35:12.210 --> 00:35:18.510
David Corman: nsf proposals are not the easiest to submit nor the sometimes you see a restaurant.

189
00:35:20.850 --> 00:35:21.600
Yueyue Fan: Okay yeah.

190
00:35:22.860 --> 00:35:28.500
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, David and hear you next question out direct to Nicole.

191
00:35:29.610 --> 00:35:44.640

Vishal Sharma: Nicole, can the panel recommendation, be a partial great as well, similar to the individual reviews so, for instance, can a team or kind of panel assign a proposal and high competitive competitive, or does it need to be a full level.

192
00:35:47.610 --> 00:36:02.370
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So in we typically don't like to have that we need to assign it to one category, so we do try to ask the panelists to make that difficult decision and move it one way or the other.

193
00:36:04.380 --> 00:36:05.220
Vishal Sharma: Thank you McCall.

194
00:36:06.720 --> 00:36:10.110
Vishal Sharma: next question David oh correct to you.

195
00:36:12.120 --> 00:36:15.900
Vishal Sharma: per panel, how many panelists can be expected.

196
00:36:16.740 --> 00:36:20.940
David Corman: Or we typically get for reviews per proposal.

197
00:36:22.020 --> 00:36:39.600
David Corman: And our where our requirement from National Science Foundation is a minimum of three proposal three refused for proposal, I would also add that on some proposals we've had five reviews.

198
00:36:41.190 --> 00:36:52.470
David Corman: Or, more depending on on each panel, but the minimum is three a typical might be four and sometimes it may be more than that.

199
00:36:56.100 --> 00:37:03.510
Vishal Sharma: Thanks David and your next question to you roll the panels be web based or will they be held in person.

200
00:37:05.340 --> 00:37:15.150

Yueyue Fan: For before September 1 all and so for panels will be held virtually so I expected this will be fully virtual.

201
00:37:16.410 --> 00:37:18.270
David Corman: Right in virtual using zoom.

202
00:37:18.600 --> 00:37:20.160
Yueyue Fan: Using zoom right okay.

203
00:37:21.630 --> 00:37:28.350
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, David in your next question McCall for you when you say Community identify.

204
00:37:28.530 --> 00:37:38.010
Vishal Sharma: problem does the Community include stakeholders, such as local governments or must it be NGOs specific Community members.

205
00:37:39.300 --> 00:37:45.630
Vishal Sharma: So I think this is a question is really getting at is how do we define community in the civic Program.

206
00:37:48.450 --> 00:37:54.810
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So it can be any of those fruits defining what the problem is saying that it's something that the Community cares about.

207
00:37:55.680 --> 00:37:59.790
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: we're really looking to improve quality of life in communities.

208
00:38:00.120 --> 00:38:12.240
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And what we do not want to see is that this is in an academic, which is what we tend to say so, we don't want it to be that the researchers in their own world are coming up with a solution and then and then.

209
00:38:12.630 --> 00:38:25.740

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: You know guessing that this is what the Community wants, so the proposing team just needs to make the case that this is what the Community wants, whatever their community is so it could be a nonprofit organization and yo could be.

210
00:38:27.090 --> 00:38:43.620
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: local governments and hopefully they'll be partners also on the project will be part of the collaborating team, and as long as you make that case in a strong way both in your project description and your letters of collaboration, it could have them as.

211
00:38:44.910 --> 00:38:51.660
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: As some of the senior personnel so whatever way you want to do it to prove your case it's acceptable.

212
00:38:52.200 --> 00:38:55.260
David Corman: Right now, on the add just one element here.

213
00:38:56.280 --> 00:39:10.920
David Corman: When we talk about local state government, you may want to think about both the project looking upward from the government side and down to perhaps the individual.

214
00:39:11.460 --> 00:39:27.840
David Corman: that are in the Community or represented by Community organizers Community partners so it could look up, as well as down to perhaps individuals or groups of individuals.

215
00:39:29.220 --> 00:39:39.690
Yueyue Fan: And then just want to add one more thing semak has a different definition of a communities with the general sncc solicitation.

216
00:39:40.350 --> 00:40:02.670
Yueyue Fan: For civic we do require communities that's that are defined by geographic boundaries so governments are usually considered as a civic partners, but the proposal also needed to have pilot projects implemented in a specific Community of multiple communities.

217
00:40:06.060 --> 00:40:17.700

Vishal Sharma: Within the next question i'll direct to you, David, this was actually two separate questions we received but they're both trying to kind of get out, I think the same point, and asking the same thing.

218
00:40:19.080 --> 00:40:28.500
Vishal Sharma: One of the attendees is asking if you have any suggestions for how to be successful, we pick to serve as a reviewer they say that they have applied in the past but we're not selected.

219
00:40:28.890 --> 00:40:43.230
Vishal Sharma: As the civic programs strictly picking only faculty that have stem degrees, as your viewers, or can people beyond the sciences from let's say design architecture arts humanities service reviewers as well and kind of.

220
00:40:43.770 --> 00:40:50.370
Vishal Sharma: Putting this together with the other question we have what areas of expertise is the program really looking to draw the panelists from.

221
00:40:51.030 --> 00:40:51.690
David Corman: yeah so.

222
00:40:52.920 --> 00:41:04.890
David Corman: When we drop panelists is I think McCall mentioned, we tried to get panelists that are that span a variety of disciplines, they may be, on the engineering side.

223
00:41:05.280 --> 00:41:18.510
David Corman: They might include some computer scientists and we also look at social scientists we've had frequently panels that include urban or regional planners.

224
00:41:19.260 --> 00:41:32.520
David Corman: Political scientists sociologists, one of the criteria that we really have is, as we look at panel dates, we have a set of proposals that belong to a panel.

225
00:41:33.210 --> 00:41:53.310

David Corman: We want to find, who is available or particular dates and the best thing that you can do as a prospective panelists is to really say you've got good really strong availability, so that when we look at.

226
00:41:54.330 --> 00:42:17.250
David Corman: The set of proposals, the panel lead, will be able to say hey this person is available and fills a gap, and I really need to have to review a set of proposals for the panel so it's to some degree that convergence of availability and skills and yes.

227
00:42:18.720 --> 00:42:39.720
David Corman: We have a number of panelists that have been at architects people that are working, the design planning humanities, etc, so those are are clearly areas that are important, especially as you look at the social outcomes of the ideas.

228
00:42:41.580 --> 00:42:57.480
Vishal Sharma: Thank you Dave and next question i'll direct you Nicole if a person applies to track a can they serve as a reviewer for crack be, can you provide some clarification on the conflicts of interest in terms of if you are proposing to specific track.

229
00:42:59.400 --> 00:43:13.860
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So if you propose only to track a, then you can sub, then you can serve as a reviewer for track be if you submit only to track feet, then you can serve as a reviewer for track hey.

230
00:43:14.430 --> 00:43:27.840
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: If you submit to both you cannot serve as a reviewer we have essentially two pots of money, so if your recommendations for one track does not impact the recommendations for the other track.

231
00:43:30.120 --> 00:43:48.240
Vishal Sharma: Thank you McCall next question i'll direct to David David, to what extent does the API on a proposal have to have prior experience working with the Community being considered or working with any other community in the past, for that matter is that a prerequisite.

232
00:43:49.230 --> 00:43:49.530
Oh.

233
00:43:50.820 --> 00:44:03.180
David Corman: I would, I would add one, let me answer the question two ways it's not a prerequisite, but imagine that you're on the panel one of those questions that panel may ask.

234
00:44:03.900 --> 00:44:17.670
David Corman: And this is a point that I raised frequently if you're submitting a proposal, think about the questions that the panel might ask so put yourself in the panelists perspective.

235
00:44:18.750 --> 00:44:22.470
David Corman: you've got to be convincing that one.

236
00:44:24.090 --> 00:44:38.250
David Corman: you've got a great research plan and that you're going to be able to create and bring this research vision to bear with the Community and civic partners that you're going to work.

237
00:44:39.180 --> 00:44:50.160
David Corman: So it's us the proposer that's responsible for making that story making that case and making it in a convincing man.

238
00:44:51.600 --> 00:44:57.600
David Corman: So is it a prerequisite, no but you've got to really make that strong case.

239
00:45:01.020 --> 00:45:09.480
Vishal Sharma: David next question i'll direct you yo yo yo yo can the planning phase, be used to identify or refine the Community identified problems.

240
00:45:11.040 --> 00:45:11.640
Yueyue Fan: um.

241
00:45:13.620 --> 00:45:32.970
Yueyue Fan: Please keep in mind that the planning grant is only six months, so if you really have to work out sort out what problems those communities are facing it may not be enough time, but if you use the planning granted to.

242
00:45:33.570 --> 00:45:56.880
Yueyue Fan: refine some of the stoves are kind of narrow down have more clear agenda for the for the identify the directions that would be certainly suitable so basically we're providing planning grant for the team to identify key research components for the second stage project.

243
00:45:58.410 --> 00:46:21.180
David Corman: You just just to kind of briefly say it planning grants are not meant to be green fields where I decided I create, let me build a whole new idea, let me build all new civic partnerships it's meant as yo yo said refine my idea refine the Community refine the partnerships.

244
00:46:22.050 --> 00:46:27.540
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And next i'd like to add something to this as well, since this is, this is a very important question that's being asked.

245
00:46:27.840 --> 00:46:34.710
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So keep in mind that, for the project description, the first section is your vision for your stage to pilot.

246
00:46:35.070 --> 00:46:51.900
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So if you say in your planning grants that you want to use this as a participatory process to figure out what that vision is you're not going to review very well compared to the other proposals that are following those instructions to to look to describe what that vision.

247
00:46:52.950 --> 00:46:53.940
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Of the stage do pilot.

248
00:46:55.950 --> 00:46:58.710
Vishal Sharma: Alright, thank you, David yo yo and McCall.

249
00:47:00.270 --> 00:47:09.450
Vishal Sharma: Following up on a question someone along similar lines our direct this to you, David, but other members of the team are also welcome to answer this.

250
00:47:09.960 --> 00:47:17.490
Vishal Sharma: What forms of Edit evidence are acceptable to show that in need identifying a civic proposal is coming from the Community.

251
00:47:18.030 --> 00:47:29.580
Vishal Sharma: The need may not be documented in a peer reviewed study for a reference section and statistics may be limited in some cases, so how can TV show, but the meat is coming from the Community so.

252
00:47:30.870 --> 00:47:37.140
David Corman: So, ideally, there are some references but frankly as you're working with your community.

253
00:47:38.610 --> 00:47:48.780
David Corman: One of those things that you can do is put together your Community Partner should be thinking about what should go in my letter of collaboration.

254
00:47:50.220 --> 00:48:04.440
David Corman: And that could be one place where you identify, this is a clear issue that we are concerned about on the Community side and.

255
00:48:05.940 --> 00:48:17.880
David Corman: That you do it in in some cases, some of the challenges that communities have are totally are are sometimes very obvious.

256
00:48:19.260 --> 00:48:31.620
David Corman: And you know, a panel which you have to look at is, will the panel say yes, this truly does make sense that it's a Community Community problem.

257
00:48:32.400 --> 00:48:48.210
David Corman: And that that idea as the planning grant evolves will get more and more input and refinement from the Community partner as you build your proposal for stage and.

258
00:48:52.380 --> 00:48:52.800
David.

259
00:48:54.540 --> 00:49:06.540
Vishal Sharma: Read the next question to McCall you call this the team needs to be completed for the planning proposal or assembling the team can be one of the activities in a training proposal.

260
00:49:10.230 --> 00:49:23.190
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: They during the planning phase, and you can you should certainly be considering who else may need to be added to your team, whether it's additional academic expertise.

261
00:49:24.210 --> 00:49:36.600
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: or Community Members as David said kind of going up or down right if it's more the resident or end user perspective if it's the champions, whoever it needs to be.

262
00:49:37.830 --> 00:49:45.090
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: In the the project to you can do some of that maybe there's industry partner, you can do that as part of your planning phase.

263
00:49:45.600 --> 00:49:58.080
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: um but, again, what the what the reviewers will find is that the the vast majority of the projects that end up being successful are the ones who.

264
00:49:58.590 --> 00:50:05.820
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: are coming into the planning phase with a fairly comprehensive set of.

265
00:50:06.480 --> 00:50:19.470
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Where the partnerships are fairly comprehensive and then the reviewers actually may suggest an area that that the team should consider and that's that's okay if there's a few gaps, but it should be strong to start off it.

266
00:50:21.030 --> 00:50:29.550
David Corman: So you're one of the things that we've learned also as we've executed our our planning grant phase, or the first go around.

267

00:50:30.300 --> 00:50:44.100
David Corman: Is that some ideas that were in the research vision originally that transformed, and you may realize that you need to add some strengths in one area.

268
00:50:45.060 --> 00:51:02.520
David Corman: or potentially reduce emphasis and another, so there may be some fluidity in your in your team building but that's part of the planning grant process where you really are refining your idea.

269
00:51:03.240 --> 00:51:19.680
David Corman: Working together as a team and learning is your vision complete enough or in booth do you need to add to make it complete or subtract to be able to it, to address the issues.

270
00:51:22.860 --> 00:51:24.240
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, David.

271
00:51:25.650 --> 00:51:28.680
Vishal Sharma: next question, I will direct you.

272
00:51:31.320 --> 00:51:43.650
Vishal Sharma: To McCall and the planning proposal two teams need to describe the tasks to be implemented during the planning stage or also can they talk about what things they will do in Stage two.

273
00:51:46.020 --> 00:51:51.750
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So I guess that's correct, they need to do both so we have the need to describe their vision.

274
00:51:53.040 --> 00:52:10.050
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: For their stage to pilot because that's what's you know, in part, really being evaluated is, what do you actually want to do if you if you were to receive that full award um the other piece of it that the panel will be evaluating is.

275
00:52:11.340 --> 00:52:15.390
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: What are those tasks that are those steps activities.

276
00:52:16.440 --> 00:52:25.830
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Capacity building that your team needs to do during the stage one planning phase to prepare you for Stage two.

277
00:52:29.850 --> 00:52:43.380
Vishal Sharma: folks are also joined by another member of the civic program team, I would just like to briefly introduce as well we're joined by Barbara rants and from nsf geosciences direct and Barbara direct the next question to you.

278
00:52:45.210 --> 00:52:51.930
Vishal Sharma: Within a proposal, how much space contents patient a team dedicated to talk about their vision for Stage two.

279
00:52:53.520 --> 00:53:03.150
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Well, you only have seven pages in this proposal, as I understand, and so you don't have that much space to actually talk about what you want to do.

280
00:53:03.960 --> 00:53:13.530
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: So the thing is it's up to you to decide how you want to balance what the information that is required in the solicitation.

281
00:53:14.250 --> 00:53:24.660
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: So I can't tell you how much you should put in there, or how much you should put in there, but think about it as David was saying, think about it, if you were a panelist on this competition.

282
00:53:25.980 --> 00:53:27.630
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: What would be most compelling.

283
00:53:28.710 --> 00:53:36.390
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: For you, as the panelists to see in a proposal to really want to make that move forward to a recommendation.

284
00:53:40.080 --> 00:53:57.360

Vishal Sharma: Thank you, Barbara next question i'll direct to McCall the recommended format for letters of collaboration is pretty tightly defined in the nsf PA PPT document should the letters for civic be more expanded than that.

285
00:53:59.160 --> 00:54:07.170
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Right, so in my civic solicitation we actually state that it is allowable to use that standard letter.

286
00:54:07.890 --> 00:54:32.430
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: But we actually encourage the proposing teams to to not use that standard letter and you can include additional content about your partnership and the strength of it, and what the activities are that the collaborators plan to do and work with with the team so.

287
00:54:32.700 --> 00:54:36.450
David Corman: yeah look, let me, let me say a couple things so first.

288
00:54:38.640 --> 00:54:49.920
David Corman: If you use if you not use the standard format your letter needs to really address what is the collaborator doing who they are.

289
00:54:50.940 --> 00:55:05.010
David Corman: And it should not come across as a letter of support letter of support is one that says, these are great people that i've worked with and we're thrilled.

290
00:55:06.090 --> 00:55:25.620
David Corman: So we expect to see good information describing the collaboration describing roles and activities that are going to be performed by the collaborating institution, if you use the standard letter or the recommended letter.

291
00:55:26.640 --> 00:55:36.390
David Corman: One you need to be very clear in the proposal exactly what are the civic partners doing.

292
00:55:37.440 --> 00:55:54.270
David Corman: And you can use that ball, you can describe those activities fault in the project description and in the facility section, there is also both it's an unlimited.

293
00:55:54.840 --> 00:56:03.240
David Corman: Page face section, so instead of putting just picture glossy pictures of servers and offices.

294
00:56:03.870 --> 00:56:17.910
David Corman: You should be describing what are, who are the unfunded or funded collaborators and their specific roles analysts will need to be able to find that information.

295
00:56:18.390 --> 00:56:37.050
David Corman: And us the proposer need to make it very clear what are those specific activities being performed by civic partners, especially if there's a lack of information in a collaboration wider.

296
00:56:39.270 --> 00:56:40.260
David Corman: Barbara you've got.

297
00:56:40.860 --> 00:56:50.400
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: An a down something i'd like to just mention is that you know it can be very effective okay it's very difficult.

298
00:56:51.930 --> 00:56:57.540
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: When you've got a little bit of real estate it's very difficult to cover all the bases, but you know what if you can create a table.

299
00:56:58.170 --> 00:57:04.860
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Of all of the people that are involved in your operation and then have who they are, where they're from and then what they're going to do.

300
00:57:05.100 --> 00:57:13.410
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: As a table that is like probably the most condensed way that you can actually address these issues so it's something that you don't have to do it.

301
00:57:13.770 --> 00:57:23.850

Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: But you might think about doing it, if you want to really try to you know convey the information that you want to convey, and also in that facilities and equipment that.

302
00:57:24.630 --> 00:57:31.920
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Section that David was talking about that's another place for you to actually describe in more detail what these partners are going to be doing.

303
00:57:32.850 --> 00:57:43.320
David Corman: You know one thing that I would add, with and barbara's comments very germane one thing that I want to add is make sure your proposal is readable.

304
00:57:45.240 --> 00:58:00.690
David Corman: there's some minimum fonts I think minimum pitch panelists never like to read a proposal that is very difficult to read that you have to read that hundred and 50% magnification.

305
00:58:02.670 --> 00:58:07.710
David Corman: So make check and if there's information in a table or in a figure.

306
00:58:08.760 --> 00:58:13.320
David Corman: Make sure that it's readable it's nothing worse for our panelists then.

307
00:58:14.730 --> 00:58:18.210
David Corman: saying something Darren not being able to read.

308
00:58:18.210 --> 00:58:18.330
It.

309
00:58:19.380 --> 00:58:35.580
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: yeah and basically if they can't read it easily they won't read it, and so you've lost all of that information for your pitch because they didn't want to spend the time they've got other proposals to read so it's not like they're only reading yours.

310
00:58:39.870 --> 00:58:40.650

Vishal Sharma: Thank you everyone.

311
00:58:41.880 --> 00:58:47.280
Vishal Sharma: kind of following along questions about how to show your Community partnerships and know.

312
00:58:48.030 --> 00:58:56.490
Vishal Sharma: Establishing relationship, but communities and getting that across the proposals we have an audience Member who's saying a community may not be particularly organized.

313
00:58:57.150 --> 00:59:11.970
Vishal Sharma: You know, with a representative body and and let her head, there may be a set of individuals, you know some known as you know, informal local power brokers, how do reviewers assess the strength of such informal partnerships in the letters that are provided.

314
00:59:13.410 --> 00:59:15.180
Vishal Sharma: David you want to answer that.

315
00:59:16.050 --> 00:59:28.380
David Corman: i'm the only answer is, they can only review what you told them so you've got to give them a clear indication of.

316
00:59:29.790 --> 00:59:37.980
David Corman: who they are, why they form a community and their specific role within the Community.

317
00:59:39.390 --> 00:59:45.480
David Corman: They can only review proposals only contain the content that you can review.

318
00:59:46.560 --> 00:59:58.020
David Corman: So it has to be very clear from what you put together are they powerbrokers what evidence what evidence can you provide that tells us that.

319
01:00:00.360 --> 01:00:07.710

Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: yeah Community activists many times are not on the mayor's office or in urban planning like.

320
01:00:09.210 --> 01:00:15.270
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: You know, local government, but there are ways that you can actually transmit.

321
01:00:16.470 --> 01:00:24.600
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Who these activists are many times are associated with local activist groups that have actual names.

322
01:00:24.990 --> 01:00:36.570
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: And, or you know you can reference newspaper articles in which they're featured there are lots of ways that you can transmit this information in your proposal if they're critical to your operation.

323
01:00:37.680 --> 01:00:54.510
Yueyue Fan: Right and then i've seen some teams also do a pre proposal survey, you could send out the survey questions collect information from the communities that you want to work with and use that as a convincing.

324
01:00:55.020 --> 01:01:03.510
Yueyue Fan: element to convince the panel, that this is actually a problem that I care to by the Community.

325
01:01:07.560 --> 01:01:25.830
Vishal Sharma: Thank you everyone folks we still have some time left the weather and the q&a session is notice that the pace of questions coming in, has slowed down so if you still have questions life may encourage you to close them now with that said i'll direct the next question to McCall.

326
01:01:27.510 --> 01:01:32.490
Vishal Sharma: Also, about standard nsf letters and the letters of collaboration.

327
01:01:33.210 --> 01:01:50.100

Vishal Sharma: Generally speaking, is it dangerous for teams to not use the standard and SF letter in case one wrong word or phrase in someone's letter leads full proposal to be tossed is that not true it's kind of a fact check Is this true or not.

328
01:01:51.870 --> 01:02:06.060
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: We have not it's as far as I remember, we have not done that in this program, but I would go back to something is sort of along the lines of selling and Barbara sent earlier about imagine yourself as the.

329
01:02:06.840 --> 01:02:15.360
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: reviewers potential, this is really a you know, a session for the reviewers so think to yourself, however reviewer would consider that letter.

330
01:02:16.350 --> 01:02:28.590
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: And it should not be a letter of support if there's language in there, that you as a reviewer would question whether this is a letter of collaboration or letter of support, then that should be a red flag for you.

331
01:02:30.120 --> 01:02:37.500
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: So what you can do is, you should never include any supplementary document in your proposal that you have not personally read.

332
01:02:38.070 --> 01:02:42.540
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Okay, so if you read it, and you think this sounds more like a support letter.

333
01:02:42.990 --> 01:02:49.050
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: than a letter of collaboration, then you get back to that partner and you say hey you got to revise this this camp look like.

334
01:02:49.440 --> 01:02:56.580
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: blah, you know or this this paragraph, needs to be struck and why don't you talk more about what you're going to do, I mean you can.

335
01:02:57.330 --> 01:03:07.080

Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Do those kinds of things you know so think about doing that make sure you read those letters from the point of view of a panelist or from it the point of view of nsf.

336
01:03:07.740 --> 01:03:16.380
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: and make sure that what's in those letters actually does transmit what you need to have in your proposal to make it compelling and.

337
01:03:16.560 --> 01:03:25.380
David Corman: Usually, these are, this is a question that frequently comes up and frequently it may be solicitation dependent.

338
01:03:26.760 --> 01:03:43.230
David Corman: So a given solicitation may say you need to use the recommended nsf letter for letters of collaboration at the same time there's also some hesitation.

339
01:03:43.740 --> 01:04:02.490
David Corman: At an institution level, perhaps because they've had proposals returned to say you know all these are my projects are my proposal set my institution will submit I only will allow.

340
01:04:04.200 --> 01:04:04.470
David Corman: The.

341
01:04:05.520 --> 01:04:12.120
David Corman: nsf if we recommended letter of collaboration if that's the case.

342
01:04:13.980 --> 01:04:29.340
David Corman: follow what we suggested, which is really somewhere inside the proposal you will need to really detail the extent of that collaboration and specific roles and responsibilities.

343
01:04:30.720 --> 01:04:36.840
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: The other thing is, and it says this and the nsf grant proposal guide that php PG.

344

01:04:37.530 --> 01:04:47.880
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: That, no matter what the nsf rules are the solicitation that's written always trump's those rules so whatever is in the solicitation.

345
01:04:48.810 --> 01:05:00.900
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: is really what needs to be put into the proposal, so you can always show to your sponsored projects office or whoever is going to be submitting the proposal if they come to you saying like no, we will only accept the.

346
01:05:01.470 --> 01:05:14.550
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Standard nsf letter you say up the solicitation actually specifies that the letter can have other information in it and so that's really what rules what comes into the proposal.

347
01:05:16.410 --> 01:05:26.010
David Corman: I believe we may have a two page limit on that I have to remember that that a letter of collaboration can be at most.

348
01:05:31.410 --> 01:05:33.000
Vishal Sharma: Thanks everyone for the answer.

349
01:05:34.560 --> 01:05:42.180
Vishal Sharma: The next question is a really good question and i'll start with you, David, but other members of the program team, please feel free to chime in as well.

350
01:05:43.980 --> 01:05:51.450
Vishal Sharma: How should reviewers address the intellectual merit portions given the applied nature of the seven Program.

351
01:05:54.870 --> 01:06:26.190
David Corman: So and that's that's actually an excellent question and one has to think so, what makes the idea somewhat creative is the plan going to have impact on the Community is the team capable of actually executing that plan is the plan, comprehensive and do they indicate.

352
01:06:28.230 --> 01:06:39.150

David Corman: Do we do we see a level of innovation in there, one of the things clearly in 12 months, and this plus a six month planning period.

353
01:06:39.720 --> 01:07:05.490
David Corman: We are not looking for the same level of fundamental research that will be that in most, if not practically all core nsf research solicitations we're looking for ideas that have merit have a degree of innovation.

354
01:07:06.930 --> 01:07:17.760
David Corman: And can really transition research ideas that may have been accomplished on other programs.

355
01:07:18.960 --> 01:07:38.310
David Corman: Not necessarily run by nsf or other MIT more mission focused organizations transition those into practice with a community and have sustain up at all show scalability.

356
01:07:39.090 --> 01:07:55.800
David Corman: Transfer ability and potential sustainability with a pilot that will provide convincing evidence of impact over 12 months following the vision.

357
01:07:57.690 --> 01:08:05.160
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: yeah and in fact okay nsf that's two criteria, as you know, intellectual merit and broader impacts.

358
01:08:05.610 --> 01:08:14.250
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: And it's never like intellectual merit is like 80% of the proposal and broader impacts is 20% of the proposal that's a sliding scale between those two things.

359
01:08:14.640 --> 01:08:30.960
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Okay, so really keep that in mind, and actually some of the intellectual merit could be that you can actually deliver something to some kind of a community and make something really great happen there, I mean that actually has a lot of intellectual punch so.

360
01:08:32.010 --> 01:08:39.600
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: You know don't think about these like normal core proposals because they are not, these are really about helping other communities.

361
01:08:40.080 --> 01:08:49.590
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Communities out there are you taking things that are knowledge is already known, for the most part and finding ways to actually make that happen for people.

362
01:08:49.920 --> 01:08:54.330
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: In the in a real sense and, in fact, you know that is intellectual merit right there.

363
01:08:54.840 --> 01:09:04.140
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: So, think about it, I mean but it can't be something that's incremental like oh yeah you know we're going to do this, you know, has 1000 other people have done it but they haven't done it in this one community.

364
01:09:04.710 --> 01:09:15.570
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: Okay, so just keep that in mind when you're thinking about how you're going to justify your work in terms of intellectual merit and broader impacts because that's what the panelists will be doing and that's what nsf will be.

365
01:09:17.580 --> 01:09:17.760
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: and

366
01:09:18.060 --> 01:09:18.720
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: i'll add.

367
01:09:18.780 --> 01:09:27.570
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: One other piece there if you look at the questions that are usually post for intellectual merit and broader impacts from nsf.

368
01:09:27.960 --> 01:09:40.440
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Even though these projects are not maybe foundational in the way that you would think of as as one of the core programs, the same questions do make sense here.

369
01:09:40.980 --> 01:09:48.450

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So if, for example, to what extent to the proposed activities suggest an explorer creative original or potentially transformative concepts.

370
01:09:48.900 --> 01:10:02.100
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Is the plan for carrying out the activity well reason well organized based on sound rationale does incorporate a mechanism to assess success, so these questions, and you can read the others also that they they do actually still here.

371
01:10:03.210 --> 01:10:13.770
Yueyue Fan: And the question the same to a much deeper question so we don't really have a simple answer but oftentimes I use a criteria.

372
01:10:14.220 --> 01:10:34.890
Yueyue Fan: Is the knowledge that you try to transfer to the communities still kind of a living in the scientific literature, not to the practice yet if that's the case, maybe that wouldn't be a suitable effort right for civic if it's a common practice that most.

373
01:10:36.090 --> 01:10:42.990
Yueyue Fan: Consulting firms are already comfortable implementing then it's probably not a great idea for civic.

374
01:10:48.300 --> 01:11:02.460
Vishal Sharma: Thanks everyone next question i'll correct to David, how is the civic program different from nsf Spartan connected communities program but the spec to Community engagement.

375
01:11:04.080 --> 01:11:16.830
David Corman: numbers are different so so there, there are several major differences between smart and connected Community program and civic innovation challenge, first of all.

376
01:11:17.370 --> 01:11:36.450
David Corman: In terms of Community engagement in civic we really look beyond Community engagement so civic is all about, what are the partnerships between civic partners and the research side.

377
01:11:37.560 --> 01:11:52.140

David Corman: It goes beyond an academic researcher pushing ideas to a Community talking to the Community and working, perhaps with them to implement.

378
01:11:52.890 --> 01:12:16.590
David Corman: For civic we really looked far tight enter connections tight integration of those activities and, frankly, we look at ideas things like are they going to help in co creation of that idea co creation refinements and engagement at a very tight level.

379
01:12:20.670 --> 01:12:30.390
David Corman: And of course you've got a very different research horizon between smart and connected Community Program.

380
01:12:32.100 --> 01:12:34.410
David Corman: and civic engagement challenge.

381
01:12:37.440 --> 01:12:38.190
Vishal Sharma: Thanks Dave favorite.

382
01:12:39.810 --> 01:12:49.200
Vishal Sharma: next question is a also a good question when will selected panelists be notified they've been chosen for participation and civic panels.

383
01:12:52.650 --> 01:12:52.950
Vishal Sharma: Because.

384
01:12:53.550 --> 01:12:55.410
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: That one, so we will.

385
01:12:56.520 --> 01:13:11.880
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Start sending out requests likely next week on the 25th and then the process will continue till sometime in bb around mid may or a little bit after that the first few weeks in May.

386
01:13:13.560 --> 01:13:26.010

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So if you do sign up, which we hope that you will, if you haven't yet then just keep open those dates that you have said that you're available because it'll take us a number of weeks to to invite panelists.

387
01:13:26.610 --> 01:13:36.450
David Corman: So one way of thinking about this is the number of panels that we that we may end up having right now.

388
01:13:37.470 --> 01:13:52.170
David Corman: proposed proposals are doing may 5 we will figure out roughly how many panels will need and panels will be held through probably sometime in June.

389
01:13:53.460 --> 01:14:08.940
David Corman: and getting the panel process starts with us a as a potential panelist receiving a request very likely receiving a request from a program officer.

390
01:14:10.170 --> 01:14:15.450
David Corman: Are you available on this certain date for a specific panel.

391
01:14:16.470 --> 01:14:33.840
David Corman: you've all done a question many of you have done, submitted a question here, and sometimes your availability may change we don't know exactly what proposals, there are, and so, when we start building these panels.

392
01:14:35.010 --> 01:14:52.410
David Corman: We will start sending to individual potential panelists are you available for this panel starting on such and such a date addressing this track or these subtract sub proposals within a track.

393
01:14:53.580 --> 01:14:54.210
David Corman: and

394
01:14:55.590 --> 01:14:56.550
David Corman: Sometime.

395

01:14:57.810 --> 01:15:10.680
David Corman: I would say, maybe like a mid to late may most if not all of the panelists will have been formed and if you haven't heard.

396
01:15:12.090 --> 01:15:13.140
David Corman: By June.

397
01:15:14.610 --> 01:15:16.980
David Corman: that's unlikely you're going to be as.

398
01:15:21.870 --> 01:15:22.200
alright.

399
01:15:23.700 --> 01:15:29.850
Vishal Sharma: Thanks everyone next question, I will direct to McCall.

400
01:15:31.470 --> 01:15:39.150
Vishal Sharma: In this civic call for the section on civic engagement there is a question on why the combination of civic prepares.

401
01:15:39.480 --> 01:15:54.870
Vishal Sharma: Civic engagement activities and research outputs will enable the project team to close the loop and achieve significant impact, but their proposed activities Could you elaborate more about the specific guidance, that is given to composers.

402
01:15:59.880 --> 01:16:10.800
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: So what we're trying to get at with that language about closing the loop is a way that you can show if you were to do a stage two projects.

403
01:16:11.190 --> 01:16:19.680
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: That there really is an impact there's there's a real positive outcome and impact from what you are proposing so.

404
01:16:20.280 --> 01:16:29.700

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: What you propose should not just be the design of a future pilot projects or putting together a model.

405
01:16:30.270 --> 01:16:53.280
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: or something it's just a research publication, it needs to be something that can actually some kind of experimentation some kind of physical pilot activity that can then be evaluated and that that you're doing something where there's real value to the end users and you can show that.

406
01:16:59.460 --> 01:17:00.660
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, Nicole.

407
01:17:03.450 --> 01:17:16.530
Vishal Sharma: next question i'll direct to Barbara Barbara does the climate and track a require a focus on addressing environmental issues directly or is it rather more broadly defined.

408
01:17:20.310 --> 01:17:35.280
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: I don't quite understand the question, but the thing is that take a look at what the topic is and climate change, and if you can somehow make that resonate with whatever that topic is then that's great.

409
01:17:36.780 --> 01:17:47.850
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: You know i'd have to see an example of what you're talking about whether something is environmentally related to climate, I mean basically anything in the environment, these days or energy or just about anything you can relate to climate.

410
01:17:48.390 --> 01:18:05.760
Barb Ransom - NSF/GEO: So just make sure that you make that link, especially in the first couple of sentences of your proposal so that the panelists and nsf do know that you are actually falling under one of the categories that have been selected for competition for this year.

411
01:18:07.500 --> 01:18:13.470
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: yeah let me add one piece to that because we've received a number of questions about this from prospective.

412
01:18:14.490 --> 01:18:23.670

Michal Ziv-El | NSF: proposers and so, if if that case sounds like a stretch to you or if you're showing your colleagues and it sounds a bit like a stretch.

413
01:18:24.750 --> 01:18:30.870
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: It probably is so you could consider then whether it's appropriate for track meet.

414
01:18:31.320 --> 01:18:47.010
Michal Ziv-El | NSF: Or if it just is too much of a stretch for either one you can still try to apply and see what the panelists will will say about it, but the other pieces to consider another program, including our smart and connected communities program which is open to all topic areas.

415
01:18:50.910 --> 01:18:51.300
All right.

416
01:18:52.590 --> 01:18:53.910
Vishal Sharma: Thank you, Barbara the call.

417
01:18:55.080 --> 01:18:57.120
Vishal Sharma: folks it looks like we have.

418
01:18:59.370 --> 01:19:09.540
Vishal Sharma: One question left David i'll ask you this question and folks if you have any questions this is your chance before we conclude the webinar.

419
01:19:11.280 --> 01:19:15.960
Vishal Sharma: is to post it before the next answer is provided for the upcoming question.

420
01:19:17.040 --> 01:19:25.440
Vishal Sharma: Does the panelists selection David give more priority to junior faculty members, so that the panel process can also be a good learning experience for them.

421
01:19:26.610 --> 01:19:27.030
David Corman: So.

422
01:19:28.320 --> 01:19:46.980
David Corman: We agree that it's a good learning experience both the junior as well as associate and and Professor right we try when we create a panel to include both a blend of disciplines, as well as blend as a blend.

423
01:19:48.180 --> 01:20:10.980
David Corman: of experience, so we tried to take that create panels that are not just simply at a senior level or at a junior level, and one of the things that would be important as the junior faculty member is to frankly make yourself.

424
01:20:12.480 --> 01:20:44.730
David Corman: Highly available i'm on many panel prospective panel dates, because when I panel when a program director creates a panel one of those first things to look at is who is available on these particular dates and if you limit yourself to simply one or two dates the likelihood is much reduced.

425
01:20:45.780 --> 01:20:52.110
David Corman: So we agree it's a great learning experience and make yourself available.

426
01:20:55.470 --> 01:20:56.340
Vishal Sharma: Alright, thanks.

427
01:20:57.540 --> 01:21:00.240
Vishal Sharma: folks it looks like we have.

428
01:21:01.710 --> 01:21:08.640
Vishal Sharma: answered all the questions and I didn't see any new ones come in and so with that I believe we will conclude today's webinar.

429
01:21:09.060 --> 01:21:17.340
Vishal Sharma: We had several people asking if this webinar was recorded and the recording will be made available, and the answer to that as desk the recording will be made available.

430
01:21:18.600 --> 01:21:20.820

Vishal Sharma: And we will notify you when that is done so.

431
01:21:22.260 --> 01:21:35.880
Vishal Sharma: Thank you everyone for joining us for the prospective panelists webinar we hope you found this information, useful and we look forward to seeing you on the panel So hopefully soon thanks everyone.

432
01:21:37.140 --> 01:21:37.620
Yueyue Fan: Thank you.