

NSF 24-564: IUSE/Professional Formation of Engineers: Revolutionizing Engineering Departments (IUSE/PFE: RED)

Program Solicitation

Document Information

Document History

- **Posted:** April 4, 2024
- **Replaces:** [NSF 23-553](#)

[View the program page](#)



National Science Foundation

Directorate for Engineering
Engineering Education and Centers
Directorate for STEM Education
Division of Undergraduate Education

Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

September 10, 2024

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals

April 08, 2025

Second Tuesday in April, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1) proposals

September 09, 2025

Second Tuesday in September, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals



Table Of Contents

[Summary of Program Requirements](#)

[I. Introduction](#)

- II. Program Description
- III. Award Information
- IV. Eligibility Information
- V. Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions
 - A. Proposal Preparation Instructions
 - B. Budgetary Information
 - C. Due Dates
 - D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements
- VI. NSF Proposal Processing and Review Procedures
 - A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria
 - B. Review and Selection Process
- VII. Award Administration Information
 - A. Notification of the Award
 - B. Award Conditions
 - C. Reporting Requirements
- VIII. Agency Contacts
- IX. Other Information

Important Information And Revision Notes

This solicitation is revised to include four tracks.

- Track 1 – Planning: designed to help institutions of significant interest to NSF’s mission in building capacity toward the development of proposals for projects in Tracks 2, 3, & 4.
- Track 2 - Adaptation & Implementation adapt and implement evidence-based organizational change strategies and actions in the local context.
- Track 3 – Innovation – Projects develop new, revolutionary approaches and change strategies that enable the transformation of undergraduate engineering education.
- Track 4 - Innovation Partnerships - Innovation projects developed across multiple institutions, with particular interest in projects that support two-year institutions in partnership with other eligible institutions.

A greater emphasis is placed on both two- and four-year institutions being eligible to apply for all tracks. This solicitation is also updated to encourage proposals addressing a broad spectrum of engineering topics, including but not limited to advanced manufacturing, advanced wireless, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, microelectronics and semiconductors, net zero technologies, sustainability, systems engineering, and quantum engineering.

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) that is in effect for the relevant due date to which the proposal is being submitted. The NSF PAPPG is regularly revised and it is the responsibility of the proposer to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements specified in this solicitation and the applicable version of the PAPPG. Submitting a proposal prior to a specified deadline does not negate this requirement.

Summary Of Program Requirements

General Information

Program Title:

IUSE/Professional Formation of Engineers: Revolutionizing Engineering Departments (IUSE/PFE: RED)

Synopsis of Program:

Revolutionizing Engineering Departments (hereinafter referred to as RED) is designed to build upon previous efforts in engineering education research. Specifically, previous and ongoing evaluations of the NSF Engineering Education and Centers Division program and its predecessors, as well as those related programs in the Directorate for STEM Education, have shown that prior investments have significantly improved the first year of engineering students' experiences, incorporating engineering material, active learning approaches, design instruction, and a broad introduction to professional skills and a sense of professional practice – giving students an idea of what it means to become an engineer. Similarly, the senior year has seen notable change through capstone design experiences, which ask students to synthesize the technical knowledge, skills, and abilities they have gained with professional capacities, using reflective judgment to make decisions and communicate these effectively. However, this ideal of the senior year has not yet been fully realized, because many of the competencies required in capstone design, or required of professional engineers, are only partially introduced in the first year and not carried forward with significant emphasis through the sophomore and junior years.

The Directorates for Engineering (ENG) and STEM Education (EDU) are funding projects as part of the RED program, in alignment with the Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) framework and Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE) initiative. These projects are designing revolutionary new approaches to engineering education, ranging from changing the canon of engineering to fundamentally altering the way courses are structured to creating new departmental structures and educational collaborations with industry. A common thread across these projects is a focus on organizational and cultural change within the departments, involving students, faculty, staff, and industry in rethinking what it means to provide an engineering program.

In order to continue to catalyze revolutionary approaches, while expanding the reach of those that have proved efficacious in particular contexts, the RED program supports four tracks: RED Planning (Track 1), RED Adaptation and Implementation (Track 2), RED Innovation (Track 3), and RED Innovation Partnerships (Track 4). Two- and four-year institutions are encouraged to submit to any track as appropriate for their goals and context.

RED Planning (Track 1) projects will support capacity-building activities at institutions of special interest to NSF's mission, specifically two-year engineering-centered programs building transfer partnerships, two-year or four-year institutions in EPSCoR jurisdictions, Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs), and Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) seeking to level the number of degrees across of the full spectrum of diverse talent in engineering. Planning projects should provide the support for such institutions to explore the development of a RED Projects in Tracks 2, 3, & 4.

RED Adaptation and Implementation (Track 2) projects will adapt and implement evidence-based organizational change strategies and actions to the local context, which helps propagate this transformation of undergraduate engineering education.

RED Innovation (Track 3) projects will develop new, revolutionary approaches and change strategies that enable the transformation of undergraduate engineering education.

RED Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) projects will achieve the same goals as Track 3 projects across multiple institutions. Of particular interest to this track are projects partnering two-year institutions with

other eligible institutions.

Projects in tracks 2, 3, & 4 will include consideration of the cultural, organizational, structural, and pedagogical changes needed to transform one or more departments to ones in which students are engaged, develop their technical and professional skills, and establish identities as professional engineers or technologists. The focus of projects in these tracks should be on the department's disciplinary courses and program. RED project initiatives are expected to be institutionalized at the end of the funding period.

Proposals are especially encouraged that address areas of increased national interest including but not limited to advanced manufacturing, advanced wireless, artificial intelligence, biotechnology, microelectronics and semiconductors, net zero technologies, sustainability, systems engineering, and quantum engineering.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

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

- Alice L. Pawley, telephone: (703) 292-7286, email: apawley@nsf.gov
- Christine Delahanty, EDU/DUE, telephone: (703) 292-8492, email: cdehahan@nsf.gov
- Matthew A. Verleger, ENG/EEC, telephone: (703) 292-2961, email: mverlege@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):

- 47.041 --- Engineering
- 47.076 --- STEM Education

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant or Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 13 to 19

The program estimates making 10-13 awards for projects in Track 1. The program estimates making a total of 3-6 awards for projects in Tracks 2, 3, & 4.

The budget for Planning (Track 1) proposals is up to \$75,000 per year for a duration of up to 2 years.

The budget for Adaptation & Innovation (Track 2) proposals is a maximum of \$1,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years.

The budget for Innovation (Track 3) proposals is between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years.

The budget for Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals is between \$1,500,000 and \$2,500,000 for collaborations across multiple institutions for a duration of up to 5 years.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000

Estimated program budget and number of awards are subject to the availability of funds.

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members.

Special Instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of subawards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.

Who May Serve as PI:

For all tracks, the Principal Investigator (PI) must be a Department Chair/Head (or equivalent) of a department for whom a significant percentage of students will graduate or transfer to a program with a bachelor's degree in engineering or engineering technology. The PI must be empowered to provide leadership for the proposed change process. In cases where the institutional responsibilities of a Department Chair/Head do not enable them to support the degree of change being sought, a Dean, Provost, or other senior leader may serve as PI, provided they will be responsible for the active leadership of the RED project. The qualifications of the PI can be justified in the required letter from senior institutional leadership.

It is recommended that projects consider including individuals with expertise in (a) engineering education research and (b) organizational change on the leadership team.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

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

There are no restrictions or limits.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Not required
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required
- **Full Proposals:**
 - Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG)* guidelines apply. The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.
 - Full Proposals submitted via Grants.gov: *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov* guidelines apply (Note: The *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide).

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.
- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**

Not Applicable
- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

Other budgetary limitations apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

September 10, 2024

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals

April 08, 2025

Second Tuesday in April, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1) proposals

September 09, 2025

Second Tuesday in September, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals

Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:

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

Award Administration Information

Award Conditions:

Standard NSF award conditions apply.

Reporting Requirements:


Additional reporting requirements apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.


I. Introduction


The goal of the RED program is to catalyze revolutionary, not incrementally reformist, changes to the education of the next generation of engineers. Revolutionary means radically, suddenly, or completely new; producing fundamental, structural change; or going outside of or beyond existing norms and principles. The complex problems facing society in the 21st Century demand changes to the way engineers are educated and the integration of new modes of learning for engineering students [1]. For example, solving the National Academy of Engineering (NAE) Grand Challenges will require engineers who not only have deep technical knowledge, but also an understanding of the societal and global contexts in which those problems occur [2]. Obstacles to change that have been cited include underlying departmental and curricular structures, faculty reward systems, and faculty development. Among the common challenges facing engineering departments are how to weave both technical and professional skills throughout the curriculum, including skills defined by the ABET (www.abet.org [3]) outcomes; how to promote and incentivize faculty engagement in the change process; and how to create cultures of inclusion that are welcoming to students and faculty of all types. Revolutionary change is needed in the structure of departments and the way students are educated to meet these challenges.

The RED program is intended to address the holistic formation of engineers. Engineering has many unique aspects that differ from other STEM disciplines. Engineering undergraduate programs prepare students for professional practice; in

engineering, the BS degree provides eligibility to qualify for the Professional Engineer license [3]. Furthermore, in the high-tech environment upon which the global economy is based, the perennial debate about workforce shortages of engineers requires a more precise understanding of dynamic industry needs and of the abilities of departments to address them. Therefore, NSF is taking a holistic look at how engineers are being prepared for lifelong careers in technical and socio-technical professions. The RED program seeks to respond to the call from different stakeholders (e.g., industry, the public, government, and the profession itself) for Professional Formation of Engineers with a broad set of professional abilities. Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE) refers to the formal and informal processes and value systems through which people become engineers. This includes the ethical responsibility of practicing engineers to sustain and grow the profession to improve quality of life for all people. The RED program also seeks to address the fact that the percentages of persons from underrepresented groups entering into and remaining in the practice of engineering are still unacceptably low, impacting the future health of the national workforce.

[1] National Academy of Engineering. 2013. *Educating Engineers: Preparing 21st Century Leaders in the Context of New Modes of Learning: Summary of a Forum*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/18254> 

[2] National Academy of Engineering. (n.d.). *Grand Challenges - Grand Challenges for engineering*. Grand Challenges - Grand Challenges for Engineering. <https://www.engineeringchallenges.org/> 

[3] National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying. (2023, December 7). *PE exam*. NCEES. <https://ncees.org/exams/pe-exam/> 

II. Program Description

Overview

While previous efforts have made pedagogical changes to the way engineering and engineering technology students are educated, RED projects must consider the cultural, organizational, structural, and pedagogical changes needed to transform the department to one in which students are engaged, develop their technical and professional skills, and establish identities as professional engineers. In recent years there has been a growing recognition of the need to create and support an innovative and inclusive engineering profession for the 21st Century. Doing so requires an understanding of how engineers are formed and how to inculcate them with the technical and professional skills needed to solve the complex problems facing society. While some innovation has been adopted in the freshman and senior years, the middle two years remain largely untouched [4]. Educating the next generation requires that coherent technical and professional threads be developed and woven across all four years. The RED program is focusing on the middle two years because of the significance of these years play in the retention and development of engineering students and the relative lack of research on them compared to first-year and capstone research [4]. Further, the RED program focuses on structural and cultural change because past attempts have shown that curricular and pedagogical change does not take hold if underlying structures remain the same. In addition, RED funding has demonstrated the need to engage both internal (e.g., faculty, staff, administrators, students) and external (e.g., industry, community) stakeholders to build shared vision in departmental change projects [5,6]. In particular, RED projects should seek to actively include faculty at all levels throughout the project development lifecycle and to explore how to better support those faculty making change [7]. Projects are expected to include an underlying theory of change to inform the activities and expected outcomes [8-10]. RED projects should create a seamless educational experience for students in their disciplinary degree programs, bridging the foundational science and engineering courses and capstone projects. The result will be students who are prepared to be professionals in their chosen paths after graduation. Proposals from IHEs with documented success (or a clear plan to be able to demonstrate success) in awarding degrees to students from groups underrepresented in engineering are strongly encouraged.

Specific activities supported by the RED solicitation may include, but are not limited to:

- Establishing convergent technical and professional threads that must be woven across the four years, especially in core technical courses of the middle two years, in internship opportunities in the private and public sectors, and in research opportunities with faculty;

- Exploring strategies for institutional, systemic, and cultural change, including new approaches to faculty governance or department structures and to restructuring faculty incentive or reward systems;
- Exploring collaborative arrangements with industry and other stakeholders who are mutually interested in developing the best possible professional formation environment and opportunities for students;
- Exploring strategies to bridge the engineering education research-to-practice gap, primarily through faculty development and adoption of best practices in the professional formation of engineers; and
- Exploring revolutionary means of recruiting and retaining students and faculty reflective of the modern and swiftly changing demographics of the United States.
- Exploring new modes of delivering content (or facilitating learning) that respond to the learning needs of a diverse student body, making engineering more accessible.

RED Planning (Track 1): The RED Planning track supports efforts necessary to build capacity and establish collaborations endeavoring to address the broader goals of the RED program. Planning grants are designed to foster and facilitate the engineering community into thinking about how to form convergent research that supports the goals of the RED program. Planning grants must be led by IHEs that meet one or more of the following criteria (a) two-year institutions that support transfer students [11], (b) institutions in EPSCoR jurisdictions, (c) Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs), or (d) Minority Serving Institution (MSIs).

Planning grants funded through this solicitation are expected to cultivate potential RED research teams and to develop competitive RED proposals for future submissions. As a result of planning grant activities, potential RED teams should be better equipped to carry out the activities associated with a track 2, 3, or 4 RED grant. Proposers supported through this mechanism may use the funding to organize activities that help stimulate the formation of RED teams (in terms of PI, co-PI, Senior/Key Personnel, and organization type) and to crystalize the ideas and research plans to be presented in a potential RED proposal.

Examples of planning grant activities can include, but are not limited to:

- Workshop(s) to recruit and form a team in line with the goals expressed in this solicitation
- Structured mentoring for PIs and co-PIs focused on submitting for mid-size NSF awards
 - Development of research goals
 - Leadership and management of mid-size projects
- Development of a research plan that is responsive to the RED solicitation
- Building cohesiveness within the team based on best practices to address collaboration challenges such as those described in Proximity and Innovation: A Critical Assessment [12]:
 - Geographical distance: The physical distance between researchers at collaborating institutions
 - Cognitive distance: The degree of overlapping specialized knowledge between members of an inter- or multidisciplinary team
 - Social distance: The “trust and friendship” (at the micro-level) among members of the team; the personal trust between team members necessary for the team to be successful
 - Organizational distance: The methods or networks used to exchange information, knowledge, and make decisions; The level of autonomy afforded to each member of the team
 - Institutional distance: The level of shared values, norms, and language present among collaborating team members and institutions
- Assessment of planning grant goals

Given the complexity of a RED proposal, NSF recognizes that many teams will identify important research priorities but may not have the full complement of skills needed to effectively address the challenge. The planning grant can be used to support team formation activities that create opportunities for the development of partnerships between researchers

and institutions that are bi-directional and mutually beneficial, thus engaging a wide array of perspectives and scientific talent to address the national needs and grand challenges presented in the RED solicitation. The National Institutes of Health [Collaboration Team Science Field Guide](#) can provide a starting point for team formation activities. Planning grants are expected to have at least one individual who was a PI, co-PI, or Senior/Key Personnel on an awarded RED project involved in the planning grant in an advisory, mentorship, or leadership position.

RED Planning (Track 1) proposals should be prepared in accordance with the guidance for the Planning type of proposal contained in PAPPG Chapter II.F.1 and the solicitation specific instructions in Section V.A., below.

RED Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2)

The RED A&I track support projects that use evidence-based and evidence-generating change strategy approaches and actions that are adapted to the local context. The goal of this track is to:

- Generate new knowledge related to the adaptation of proven change strategies and actions in a new context.

Strategies should be developed with impact on the student as the focus. Proposed efforts must be grounded in sound educational theory and work to enable a continuous progression of professional formation through the four-year experience. Efforts should address 21st Century T-shaped skills [13] (i.e., cross-disciplinary breadth), and they should be aligned with stakeholder expectations. This track encourages proposals from two-year or four-year institutions that are interested in adopting change strategies at a single institution.

RED Innovation (Track 3):

The RED Innovation track supports projects that involve radically, suddenly, or completely new approaches and action; producing fundamental, structural change; and that go outside of or beyond existing norms and principles. Innovations in similar departments across multiple institutions is particularly encouraged. This track has two goals:

- Generate new knowledge on best practices for meaningfully and thoughtfully incorporating into the middle two years and technical core of the engineering curriculum oft-neglected “professional skills” (i.e. 21st Century skills, design, communication, teamwork, historical and contemporary social context, lifelong learning, and ethics). Changes in the middle two years need to be integrated with freshman and senior experiences in order to form an unbroken sequenced thread through the curriculum so that the process of professional formation deepens and strengthens as students move through engineering programs.
- Generate new knowledge on how to transform the departmental cultures to be environments that are inclusive, innovative, equitable and supportive of faculty, faculty development to support cultural or structural change, and build new department structures and cultures through innovative practices and policies that support significant holistic professional formation.





Strategies should be developed with impact on the student as the focus. Proposed efforts must be grounded in sound educational theory and work to enable a continuous progression of professional formation through the four-year experience. Efforts should address 21st Century T-shaped skills (i.e., cross-disciplinary breadth), and they should be aligned with stakeholder expectations.

RED Innovation Partnerships (Track 4): The RED Innovation Partnerships track holds identical goals to the RED Innovation (Track 3) track but also recognizes that developing revolutionary changes capable of spanning multiple contexts adds additional complexity and may therefore require additional resources and support. In addition to the Track 3 goals, projects in Track 4 have an additional goal to:

- Generate new knowledge on best practices and the support structures necessary for meaningfully and thoughtfully leveraging or managing cross-institutional partnerships in ways that enable transferability and interoperability of research findings.

Collaborative partnerships that include IHEs that are (a) two-year institutions that support transfer students, (b) institutions in EPSCoR jurisdictions, (c) PUIs, and/or (d) MSIs are strongly encouraged.

References:

- [4] Lord, S.M. and Chen, J.C. (2014) Curriculum Design in the Middle Years. *Cambridge Handbook of Engineering Education Research*, Johri and Olds, eds. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Doten-Snitker, K., Margherio, C., Litzler, E., Ingram, E., & Williams, J. (2021). Developing a shared vision for change: Moving toward inclusive empowerment. *Research in Higher Education*, 62, 206-229. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-020-09594-9> 
- [6] Margherio, C., Doten-Snitker, K., Williams, J., Litzler, E., Andrijcic, E., & Mohan, S. (2020). Cultivating strategic partnerships to transform STEM education. *Transforming Institutions: Accelerating Systemic Change in Higher Education*.
- [7] Cutler, S., & Strong, A. C. (2023). The Overlooked Impact of Faculty on Engineering Education. *International Handbook of Engineering Education Research*, 286.
- [8] Reinholz, D. L., & Andrews, T. C. (2020). Change theory and theory of change: what's the difference anyway?. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-0202-3> 
- [9] Reinholz, D. L., White, I., & Andrews, T. (2021). Change theory in STEM higher education: a systematic review. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 8(1), 37. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00291-2> 
- [10] Connolly, M. R., & Seymour, E. (2015). Why Theories of Change Matter. W CER Working Paper No. 2015-2. Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Retrieved from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research website: <https://wcer.wisc.edu/publications/abstract/wcer-working-paper-no.-2015-02> 
- [11] Sislin, J., & Mattis, M. C. (Eds.). (2006). Enhancing the community college pathway to engineering careers. National Academies Press.
- [12] Boschma, R. (2005). Proximity and innovation: a critical assessment. *Regional studies*, 39(1), 61-74.
- [13] Tranquillo, J. (2017). The t-shaped engineer. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations*, 30(4), 12-24.

Prospective PIs are encouraged to consider the IUSE: EDU program for projects that are outside the scope of RED (see https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505082). Specifically, the IUSE:EDU Institutional and Community Transformation (ICT) track promotes innovative approaches to using research to catalyze change that addresses challenges across and within institutions (institutional transformation), as well as within and across specific disciplines (community transformation). In addition, IUSE: Innovation in Two-Year College STEM Education (ITYC) represents NSF's intentional investment in two-year institutions and supports the development and implementation of evidence-based practices that improve STEM education at two-year institutions of higher education (see <https://new.nsf.gov/funding/opportunities/iuse-innovation-two-year-college-stem-education>). **Prospective PIs are not allowed to submit identical or substantively similar proposals to multiple NSF programs.**

III. Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant or Continuing Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: The program estimates making 10-13 awards for projects in Track 1. The program estimates making a total of 3-6 awards for projects in Tracks 2, 3, & 4.

The budget for Planning (Track 1) proposals is up to \$75,000 per year for a duration of up to 2 years.

The budget for Adaptation & Innovation (Track 2) proposals is a maximum of \$1,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years.

The budget for Innovation (Track 3) proposals is between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years.

The budget for Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals is between \$1,500,000 and \$2,500,000 for collaborations across multiple institutions for a duration of up to 5 years.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$7,000,000 - \$8,000,000

Anticipated Funding Amount and number of awards are subject to the availability of funds.

IV. Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members. Special Instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of subawards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.

Who May Serve as PI:

For all tracks, the Principal Investigator (PI) must be a Department Chair/Head (or equivalent) of a department for whom a significant percentage of students will graduate or transfer to a program with a bachelor's degree in engineering or engineering technology. The PI must be empowered to provide leadership for the proposed change process. In cases where the institutional responsibilities of a Department Chair/Head do not enable them to support the degree of change being sought, a Dean, Provost, or other senior leader may serve as PI, provided they will be responsible for the active leadership of the RED project. The qualifications of the PI can be justified in the required letter from senior institutional leadership.

It is recommended that projects consider including individuals with expertise in (a) engineering education research and (b) organizational change on the leadership team.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

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

There are no restrictions or limits.

Additional Eligibility Info:

RED Planning (Track 1) proposals may only be submitted by IHEs that meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Two-year institutions that support transfer students
- Institutions in EPSCoR jurisdictions
- Primarily Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs)
- Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs)

V. Proposal Preparation And Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

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

- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.
- Full proposals submitted via Grants.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation via Grants.gov should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov*. The complete text of the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: (https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide). To obtain copies of the Application Guide and Application Forms Package, click on the Apply tab on the Grants.gov site, then click on the Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Application Instructions link and enter the funding opportunity number, (the program solicitation number without the NSF prefix) and press the Download Package button. Paper copies of the Grants.gov Application Guide also may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

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

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

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

Proposers are encouraged to prepare their proposals with consideration for the purpose, justification, design features, and expected outcomes of Foundational Research and/or Early-stage or Exploratory Research as outlined in the *Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development* ([NSF 13-126](#)).

The following instructions supplement the guidance in the PAPPG:

RED Planning (Track 1):

The proposal should conform to the PAPPG guidance for “Planning Proposal” found in PAPPG Chapter II.F.1 except where this solicitation supersedes that guidance.

Concept outlines should be emailed to a cognizant program officer at least 30 days prior to the proposal deadline. Concept outlines should be a maximum of 2 pages addressing the following:

- The intended duration and approximate budget for the project.
- A high-level overview of the Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts of a RED Track 2, 3, or 4 project that this planning project could enable.
- How this planning project will provide the preliminary supports necessary for development of a larger proposal.

The title of the proposal must begin with: Planning: *IUSE/PFE:RED Planning*

In addition to the guidance in the PAPPG, including the requirement for a separate section labeled “Broader Impacts”, the Project Description must include:

Vision for Revolutionizing the Engineering Department– Explain what you hope to achieve in pursuing a Track 2, 3, or 4 RED grant. While the idea may not be fully developed at this stage, describe the conditions or situation that necessitates revolutionary change and broadly what you hope to achieve through the RED program. Provide a concise answer to the question, “What could be different?”

Need for Planning Support – The purpose of the planning grant is to provide the support needed to develop a competitive proposal aimed at the vision specified above. What makes the planning grant a valuable support mechanism in developing that proposal? Provide a concise answer to the question, “What can this planning grant provide that cannot be achieved using existing institutional resources?”

Project Plan –Informed by the department’s vision and need for support, provide:

- *Goals and Objectives:* Planning grant goals and objectives should address the specific needs from the planning grant. The goals and objectives should provide the outcomes and targets that will move the department toward having the capacity to pursue the vision.
- *Specific Actions:* Describe the activities that will allow achievement of the goals and objectives. Where appropriate, actions should cite relevant literature to support the specific activities. You are encouraged to review prior RED projects and the outcomes of those projects.
- *Barriers:* Identify the anticipated barriers in carrying out the planning process and pursuing the development of a RED project. Describe how these barriers will be addressed and any contingency plans that will allow achievement of the vision in the face of these barriers.
- *Current or Former RED Recipient Advisor:* Planning grants are expected to include at least one current or former RED grant leadership team member (PI, co-PI, or Senior/Key Personnel) in an advisory board, mentorship, or project leadership position as appropriate for your project needs. Briefly summarize the RED grant they were part of, their contribution to their project, and how they will help you in the development of your own RED grant.

RED Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), RED Innovation (Track 3), and RED Innovation Partnership (Track 4):

(Track 2 only) The title of the proposal must begin with: *IUSE/PFE:RED A&I*

(Track 3 only) The title of the proposal must begin with: *IUSE/PFE:RED Innovation*

(Track 4 only) The title of the proposal must begin with: *IUSE/PFE:RED Partnership*

In addition to the guidance in the PAPPG, including the requirement for a separate section labeled “Broader Impacts” the proposal should include the following information in the Project Description.

Vision and Rationale for Revolutionizing the Engineering Department– Explain why change is needed in the current department and the particular approaches on which the project is basing the change. Describe the department and the student professional formation experience “after the revolution”. Provide a concise answer to the question, “What will be different?”

(Track 2 only) Compare the contexts of the previously awarded implementation and the PI’s proposed context, describing how the original implementation is being adapted to fit the current Department or School.

Project Plan –Informed by the department’s vision for revolution, provide:

Goals and Objectives: Project goals and objectives should address the cultural, organizational, structural, and pedagogical changes needed to achieve the stated vision. The goals and objectives should provide the outcomes and targets that will move the department toward the vision.

Specific Actions: Describe the activities that will allow achievement of the goals and objectives. Activities should be based on evidence from the literature that supports their use in the department’s context. Activities should also be aligned with a theory of change that shows why and how these specific activities are expected to result in the desired change.

Barriers: Identify the anticipated barriers in carrying out the project plans and achieving the vision. Describe how these barriers will be addressed and any contingency plans that will allow achievement of the vision in the face of these barriers.

Advisory Board: There must be an advisory board comprised of external stakeholders (i.e., knowledge experts appropriate for the project, industry representatives, etc.) and leadership at the institution(s), who can provide guidance on the

conduct and direction of the project. Provide a clear description of who will be included, what they bring to the project, and how they will contribute.

Research Plan (Track 2 only): While the research expectations for Track 2 projects are substantively smaller than those for Track 3 and Track 4, there is still an expectation that Track 2 projects contribute new knowledge to the discipline. Projects should have a research plan that will add to the knowledge base about adapting and implementing change in new contexts. The research plan should have clear research questions informed by appropriate educational, behavioral, psychological, or sociological theory and appropriate research methodology. These measures can be qualitative or quantitative as appropriate to the question and theoretical orientation.

Research Plan (Track 3 & Track 4 only): RED Innovation (Track 3) and RED Innovation Partnership (Track 4) projects must have a research plan that will add to the knowledge base about creating change at the department level. The research plan should have clear research questions informed by appropriate educational, behavioral, psychological, or sociological theory and a research design that includes sampling, data collection, and data analysis methods. These measures can be qualitative or quantitative as appropriate to the question and theoretical orientation.

Evaluation Plan: All proposals must have an independent project evaluation plan that matches the scope of the proposed work. Evaluation refers to monitoring of the activities to ensure that the project stays on track and that the desired outputs and impacts are achieved. The evaluation plan should be designed to provide guidance to the project and contribute to the literature on which changes worked, why, and in what contexts. The evaluation plan should include both formative and summative components. An evaluator external to the Pls' organization is not required, but the evaluator should not be an individual who is involved in the other activities of the project. Provide a logic model that links inputs and activities to specific outputs and short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes that will allow you to determine if the project has an impact. Based on the theory of change and the desirable outcomes of the proposed revolution, enumerate appropriate indicators of success related to accomplishing the goals and objectives and a timeframe to seek measurable change. Describe the data collection and analysis plan that will allow the success of the project to be evaluated. The data management plan should address both the data collected to achieve the project objectives and the data collected to evaluate the project.

Mentoring Plans: Explain how faculty were involved in the development of the proposal; explain how faculty will be mentored over the course of this project; what faculty development opportunities will be provided; and how they will be incentivized. Explain how graduate and undergraduate students (including teaching assistants) will be involved in the project and how they will be mentored as part of the proposed departmental vision for revolution. Note that if funds are requested to support graduate students or postdoctoral researcher(s), per the PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.i.(i), a separate Mentoring Plan must be uploaded as a supplementary document.

Dissemination Plan: Provide a plan for actively disseminating the new knowledge generated from this project to other departments and institutions, including challenges and strategies to adoption in the project's context. Dissemination plans should include contributions to the literature and need to go beyond traditional approaches to ensure long-term, broad impact.

Sustainability, Scaling and Adaptation Plan: Proposals should consider sustainability of efforts after the completion of funding. RED projects should seek to sustain their own efforts and to actively influence other departments, both within the department's institution and at other institutions. Describe a roadmap for how this project will make a sustainable impact both locally and regionally/nationally by supporting revolutionary change in other departments.

Project Leadership: Describe the project leadership team, their roles, and their experience. State any relevant qualifications that cannot be readily identified through their biographical sketch. What does each member of the team contribute?

Faculty Support: Describe prior efforts at change and departmental readiness for change. How are faculty who are not members of the project leadership team being included in the planning and execution of the project? How will faculty at all levels be engaged throughout the project?

Succession Plan: Proposals should address personnel changes that will occur throughout the implementation. How will new individuals be onboarded to the project, including project leadership, faculty participants, and student research

assistants? How will data integrity and security be maintained as individuals are off-boarded? How will project continuity be maintained?

Partnership Dynamics (Track 4 only): Innovation Partnerships are designed for both institutions to implement revolutionary change together. Implementing RED ideas across multiple contexts will necessitate additional consideration for how those contexts each play a unique role in the adoption of change. How will the partnership be organized to ensure healthy communication and consideration for those unique contexts?

Supplementary Documentation (All Tracks)

List of project participants: Each RED proposal must include, as an "Other Supplementary Document", a list of the name, institutional affiliation, and role of all project personnel including the PI, co-PI(s), and senior personnel. This includes project staff, advisory board members, project evaluators, consultants, collaborators, and any other individuals participating in the project. The list should not include graduate or undergraduate students, or individuals yet to be named. This list does not replace the personnel descriptions that may be appropriate for the project description. **This listing should be the first document uploaded into the "Other Supplementary Documents" section of the proposal so that it appears as the first page of this section.**

Supplementary Documentation (Track 2, 3, and 4)

Letter(s) from Institutional Leadership

Provide letters of commitment from the Dean, Provost, and/or President (as appropriate for the project) to ensure support and feasibility in the short and long term. The letter should address how the PI is an appropriately empowered individual to lead the change being sought. As departmental leadership (and by extension, RED PIs) can often change throughout the life of a RED project, letters should also address how RED will inform the selection of new departmental leadership and how the project will be managed during interim changes in leadership. The letter(s) should be no more than 2 pages in length, and it must include the individual's name and title below the signature. Note that this guidance on letters of commitment deviates from the requirements of the PAPPG.

Letter(s) from Other Partners

Provide letters of collaboration from other partners as appropriate. The letter(s) should be no more than 1 page in length, and should include a clear description of how the partner will participate in the project. General letters of support are not allowed and the proposal may be returned without review if such letters are included.

Only the supplementary documents listed above, the required Data Management and Sharing Plan, and the required Mentoring Plan (if applicable) may be included as Supplementary Documents. Any additional information needed to evaluate the proposal must be part of the Project Description.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:

10-13 RED Planning (Track 1) budgets are up to \$75,000 per year for a duration of up to 2 years.

The budget for Adaptation & Innovation (Track 2) proposals is a maximum of \$1,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years. The budget for Innovation (Track 3) proposals is between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 for a duration of up to 5 years. The budget for Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals is between \$1,500,000 and \$2,500,000 for collaborations across multiple institutions for a duration of up to 5 years. Proposals that fall outside these limits will be returned without review.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

A Budget Justification prepared in accordance with the guidance in the PAPPG must be included. PI Meeting Attendance: Include travel funds in the budget for (required) team attendance at an annual PI meeting in the National Capital Region. The entire project leadership team is expected to attend these meetings and provide an update regarding project activities during the poster session.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

September 10, 2024

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals

April 08, 2025

Second Tuesday in April, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1) proposals

September 09, 2025

Second Tuesday in September, Annually Thereafter

Planning (Track 1), Adaptation & Implementation (Track 2), Innovation (Track 3), and Innovation Partnerships (Track 4) proposals

D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via Research.gov:

To prepare and submit a proposal via Research.gov, see detailed technical instructions available at:

https://www.research.gov/research-portal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Service/Desktop/ProposalPreparationanc

For Research.gov user support, call the Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-381-1532 or e-mail rgov@nsf.gov. The Research.gov Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the Research.gov system. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this funding opportunity.

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once registered, the applicant's organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website.

Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage: <https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants.html>. In addition, the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide (see link in Section V.A) provides instructions regarding the technical preparation of proposals via Grants.gov. For Grants.gov user support, contact the Grants.gov Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or by email: support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Contact Center answers general technical questions related to the use of Grants.gov. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this solicitation.

Submitting the Proposal: Once all documents have been completed, the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) must submit the application to Grants.gov and verify the desired funding opportunity and agency to which the application is submitted. The AOR must then sign and submit the application to Grants.gov. The completed application will be transferred to Research.gov for further processing.

The NSF [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov informational page](#) provides submission guidance to applicants and links to helpful resources including the NSF [Grants.gov Application Guide](#), [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov how-to guide](#), and [Grants.gov Submitted Proposals Frequently Asked Questions](#). Grants.gov proposals must pass all NSF pre-check and post-check validations in order to be accepted by Research.gov at NSF.

When submitting via Grants.gov, NSF strongly recommends applicants initiate proposal submission at least five business days in advance of a deadline to allow adequate time to address NSF compliance errors and resubmissions by 5:00 p.m. submitting organization's local time on the deadline. Please note that some errors cannot be corrected in Grants.gov. Once a proposal passes pre-checks but fails any post-check, an applicant can only correct and submit the in-progress proposal in Research.gov.

Proposers that submitted via Research.gov may use Research.gov to verify the status of their submission to NSF. For proposers that submitted via Grants.gov, until an application has been received and validated by NSF, the Authorized Organizational Representative may check the status of an application on Grants.gov. After proposers have received an e-mail notification from NSF, Research.gov should be used to check the status of an application.

VI. NSF Proposal Processing And Review Procedures

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

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

Proposers should also be aware of core strategies that are essential to the fulfillment of NSF's mission, as articulated in [Leading the World in Discovery and Innovation, STEM Talent Development and the Delivery of Benefits from Research - NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years \(FY\) 2022 - 2026](#). These strategies are integrated in the program planning and implementation process, of which proposal review is one part. NSF's mission is particularly well-implemented through the integration of research and education and broadening participation in NSF programs, projects, and activities.

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

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

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

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

1. Merit Review Principles

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

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

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of those activities.

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

2. Merit Review Criteria

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

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

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

- **Intellectual Merit:** The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and

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

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

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

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

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

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria (Track 1):

- There are no Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria for Planning (Track 1) proposals

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria (Track 2, 3, & 4):

- **Faculty Development:** Is faculty development, such as through the Mentoring Plan or Faculty Support sections of the project description, well planned and properly incentivized to build department cultures that support the holistic professional formation of engineers?
- **Potential for Success, Sustainability, and Scaling:** How likely is the project to be operationalized in a way that it will continue after the RED project is complete? How prepared is the project for changes in leadership throughout the life of the project?

B. Review and Selection Process

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

Proposals submitted in response to this solicitation are reviewed by merit review panels, ad hoc reviewers, or both. Proposals will be reviewed using the NSF Merit Review Criteria of Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts.

Contingent on the number of proposals received, Planning (Track 1) proposals may undergo external merit review.

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

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

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

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

VII. Award Administration Information

A. Notification of the Award

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

B. Award Conditions

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

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's Website at https://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the NSF *Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Build America, Buy America

As expressed in Executive Order 14005, [Ensuring the Future is Made in All of America by All of America's Workers](#) (86 FR 7475), it is the policy of the executive branch to use terms and conditions of Federal financial assistance awards to maximize, consistent with law, the use of goods, products, and materials produced in, and services offered in, the United States.

Consistent with the requirements of the Build America, Buy America Act (Pub. L. 117-58, Division G, Title IX, Subtitle A, November 15, 2021), no funding made available through this funding opportunity may be obligated for an award unless all iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in the project are produced in the United States. For additional information, visit NSF's [Build America, Buy America](#) webpage.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the Principal Investigator must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer no later than 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. (Some programs or awards require submission of more frequent project reports). No later than 120 days following expiration of a grant, the PI also is required to submit a final annual project report, and a project outcomes report for the general public.

Failure to provide the required annual or final annual project reports, or the project outcomes report, will delay NSF review and processing of any future funding increments as well as any pending proposals for all identified PIs and co-PIs on a given award. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

PIs are required to use NSF's electronic project-reporting system, available through Research.gov, for preparation and submission of annual and final annual project reports. Such reports provide information on accomplishments, project participants (individual and organizational), publications, and other specific products and impacts of the project. Submission of the report via Research.gov constitutes certification by the PI that the contents of the report are accurate and complete. The project outcomes report also must be prepared and submitted using Research.gov. This report serves as a brief summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project. This report will be posted on the NSF website exactly as it is submitted by the PI.

More comprehensive information on NSF Reporting Requirements and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

Additional Reporting

As part of the annual report, PIs should also include discussion of department dynamics and obstacles or progress in establishing a culture supportive of holistic professional formation of engineers. Recipients are required to interact and participate with the RED program's evaluative activities. Site visits may also be conducted during the second year of the project.

VIII. Agency Contacts

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

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:

- Alice L. Pawley, telephone: (703) 292-7286, email: apawley@nsf.gov
- Christine Delahanty, EDU/DUE, telephone: (703) 292-8492, email: cdehahan@nsf.gov

- Matthew A. Verleger, ENG/EEC, telephone: (703) 292-2961, email: mverlege@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of NSF systems contact:

- NSF Help Desk: 1-800-381-1532
- Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: rgov@nsf.gov

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:

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

IX. Other Information

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

Grants.gov provides an additional electronic capability to search for Federal government-wide grant opportunities. NSF funding opportunities may be accessed via this mechanism. Further information on Grants.gov may be obtained at <https://www.grants.gov>.

About The National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent Federal agency created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 USC 1861-75). The Act states the purpose of the NSF is "to promote the progress of science; [and] to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare by supporting research and education in all fields of science and engineering."

NSF funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K-12 school systems, businesses, informal science organizations and other research organizations throughout the US. The Foundation accounts for about one-fourth of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

NSF receives approximately 55,000 proposals each year for research, education and training projects, of which approximately 11,000 are funded. In addition, the Foundation receives several thousand applications for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. The agency operates no laboratories itself but does support National Research Centers, user facilities, certain oceanographic vessels and Arctic and Antarctic research stations. The Foundation also supports cooperative research between universities and industry, US participation in international scientific and engineering efforts, and educational activities at every academic level.

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* Chapter II.F.7 for instructions regarding preparation of these types of proposals.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090 and (800) 281-8749, FIRS at (800) 877-8339.

The National Science Foundation Information Center may be reached at (703) 292-5111.

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Website at <https://www.nsf.gov>

- **Location:** 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314
- **For General Information** (NSF Information Center): (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090
- **To Order Publications or Forms:**
 - Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov
 - or telephone: (703) 292-8134
- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

Privacy Act And Public Burden Statements

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by proposers will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding proposers or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See [System of Record Notices, NSF-50](#), "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," and [NSF-51](#), "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records." Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding the burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

Suzanne H. Plimpton
Reports Clearance Officer
Policy Office, Division of Institution and Award Support
Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management
National Science Foundation
Alexandria, VA 22314

[Vulnerability disclosure](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [Privacy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [No FEAR Act](#) | [USA.gov](#) | [Accessibility](#) |

[Plain language](#) |



National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: [\(703\) 292-5111](tel:7032925111),