

# NSF 25-522: EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement: EPSCoR Research Incubators for STEM Excellence (E-RISE)

## Program Solicitation

### Document Information

#### Document History

- **Posted:** December 13, 2024
- **Replaces:** [NSF 23-588](#)

[View the program page](#)



**U.S. National Science Foundation**  
Office of Integrative Activities

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

August 12, 2025

Second Tuesday in August, Annually Thereafter

### 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

- The total award budget was increased to \$8 million for the initial four-year period.
- The eligibility criteria were expanded for submitting organizations that serve as the lead organization on a current E-RISE or RII Track-1 award.
- Additional details were provided on the maximum number of E-RISE proposals or awards for a PI or co-PI.
- Additional details were provided on required jurisdictional connections between a jurisdiction's E-RISE awards, E-CORE awards, and EPSCoR/Jurisdiction State Offices.
- A requirement was added for E-RISE projects to include a networking/partnership manager as part of the project management team.
- A requirement was added for notifying the Jurisdictional Steering Committee of an E-RISE proposal submission.
- The requirement that each collaborating organization be represented by a PI or at least one co-PI was extended to include senior personnel.
- Additional details were provided regarding renewal project proposals and awards.

The EPSCoR Research Incubators for STEM Excellence Research: Infrastructure Improvement (E-RISE) Program responds directly to input from recent national studies and legislation, including the [2022 2M Study of EPSCoR, Envisioning the Future of NSF EPSCoR](#) report, and the [CHIPS and Science Act of 2022 \(Public Law 117-167\)](#). E-RISE focuses on the development and sustainability of EPSCoR-eligible jurisdictions' research capacity and competitiveness in a scientific topical area. NSF EPSCoR eligibility is based on a jurisdiction's most recent five-year history of total funds awarded by NSF relative to the Foundation's total research budget for that same period. The [CHIPS and Science Act of 2022 \(P.L. 117-167\)](#) suspends inclusion of new or graduation of existing EPSCoR jurisdictions through fiscal year 2027. Additional details on the EPSCoR eligibility criteria are available on the NSF EPSCoR website (see RII [eligibility](#)).

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:**

EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement Program: EPSCoR Research Incubators for STEM

**Excellence (E-RISE) Synopsis of Program:**

The Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) supports the mission of the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) by promoting nationwide scientific progress. Through this program, NSF fosters partnerships among academic institutions, government entities, industry, and non-profits. These collaborations aim to drive long-term improvements in research infrastructure, enhance R&D capacity, and boost the research competitiveness of eligible EPSCoR jurisdictions, including states, territories, and commonwealths.

A jurisdiction's research ecosystem is the interconnected network of institutions, organizations, researchers, trainees, community stakeholders, and resources that contribute to the process of research and innovation that advances fundamental knowledge, generates use-inspired products, and ultimately cultivates beneficial societal impacts for a jurisdiction. E-RISE supports hypothesis-driven or problem-driven research and fosters the development of research teams and products in a scientific topical area that aligns with a jurisdiction's research ecosystem and priorities, as detailed in the jurisdiction's Science and Technology (S&T) Plan or drawn from other jurisdiction plans, reports, or publications prepared by appropriate authorities or bodies. E-RISE invites innovative proposals within the chosen research area that will lead to development and implementation of sustainable broad networks of individuals, institutions, and organizations, and that will transform the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) research capacity and competitiveness in a jurisdiction. E-RISE is particularly interested in proposals that justify exploring emerging or interdisciplinary research areas with high potential impact.

E-RISE projects must have a clearly articulated research goal that will lead to new knowledge by addressing a clear hypothesis or problem. The E-RISE project should promote (i) areas of research capacity-building within a chosen research topic; (ii) development of a skilled workforce that is relevant to the research topic, as well as the project and its outcomes; (iii) a culture of collaboration and engagement across different types of academic institutions and organizations, as well as non-academic sectors (e.g., industry and government); (iv) integration of the research with societal impacts; and (v) a clear sustainability plan to preserve the resulting research incubator's team and products beyond E-RISE funding.

**Broadening Participation In STEM:**

NSF recognizes the unique lived experiences of individuals from communities that are underrepresented and/or underserved in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and the barriers to inclusion and access to STEM education and careers. NSF highly encourages the leadership, partnership, and contributions in all NSF opportunities of individuals who are members of such communities supported by NSF. This includes leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding; serving as peer reviewers, advisory committee members, and/or committee of visitor members; and serving as NSF leadership, program, and/or administrative staff. NSF also highly encourages demographically diverse institutions of higher education (IHEs) to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities on behalf of their research and education communities. NSF expects that all individuals, including those who are members of groups that are underrepresented and/or underserved in STEM, are treated equitably and inclusively in the Foundation's proposal and award process.

NSF encourages IHEs that enroll, educate, graduate, and employ individuals who are members of groups underrepresented and/or underserved in STEM education programs and careers to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities, including leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding. Such IHEs include, but may not be limited to, community colleges and two-year institutions, mission-based institutions such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), women's colleges, and institutions that

primarily serve persons with disabilities, as well as institutions defined by enrollment such as Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs), Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs), and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs).

"Broadening participation in STEM" is the comprehensive phrase used by NSF to refer to the Foundation's goal of increasing the representation and diversity of individuals, organizations, and geographic regions that contribute to STEM teaching, research, and innovation. To broaden participation in STEM, it is necessary to address issues of equity, inclusion, and access in STEM education, training, and careers. Whereas all NSF programs might support broadening participation components, some programs primarily focus on supporting broadening participation research and projects. Examples can be found on the NSF [Broadening Participation in STEM](#) website.

**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.*

- Casonya M. Johnson, telephone: (703)292-2658, email: [casjohns@nsf.gov](mailto:casjohns@nsf.gov)
- Chinonye Whitley, telephone: (703)292-8458, email: [cwhitley@nsf.gov](mailto:cwhitley@nsf.gov)
- Pinhas Ben-Tzvi, telephone: (703) 292-8246, email: [pbentzvi@nsf.gov](mailto:pbentzvi@nsf.gov)
- Lisa C. Cliggett, telephone: (703) 292-2759, email: [lcligget@nsf.gov](mailto:lcligget@nsf.gov)
- Jose Colom-Ustariz, telephone: (703) 292-7088, email: [jcolom@nsf.gov](mailto:jcolom@nsf.gov)
- Andrea Johnson, telephone: (703) 292-5164, email: [ANDJOHNS@nsf.gov](mailto:ANDJOHNS@nsf.gov)
- Hongmei Luo, telephone: (703) 292-8867, email: [hluo@nsf.gov](mailto:hluo@nsf.gov)
- Benjamin J. McCall, telephone: (703) 292-7916, email: [bjmccall@nsf.gov](mailto:bjmccall@nsf.gov)
- Jeanne R. Small, telephone: (703) 292-8623, email: [jsmall@nsf.gov](mailto:jsmall@nsf.gov)

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

- 47.083 --- Office of Integrative Activities (OIA)

**Award Information**

**Anticipated Type of Award:** Continuing Grant

**Estimated Number of Awards:** 15

Up to 15 awards annually (pending the quality of proposals and availability of funds). More than one award per jurisdiction will be considered pending the availability of funds.

Awards will be funded for four years, with eligibility to request renewal project funding through the submission of a renewal project proposal at the end of year three. Continued funding over the four years of the initial award, and approval for renewal project funding will be contingent upon satisfactory progress as based on the annual reporting requirements and progress towards implementing the strategic plan.

**Anticipated Funding Amount:** \$31,500,000

Up to \$31,500,000 annually, to support up to 15 newly funded E-RISE awards. Number of awards is approximate and subject to the availability of funds and quality of the proposals submitted.

Funding requests must be for a duration of four (4) years, with a maximum budget \$8,000,000 total for four years and the potential for a renewal project award with a maximum budget of \$4,500,000 total for an additional three (3) years. Within

the maximum award budget, there is no restriction on the amount requested annually. When applicable, renewal project awards will only be made subsequent to the closure of the original award.

Note that in only rare and exceptional circumstances will no-cost extensions of the initial award or the renewal project award be granted beyond the grantee-approved no-cost extension.

NSF EPSCoR support of a proposed Research Infrastructure Improvement activity should not duplicate other available federal, jurisdictional, or institutional resources and should add significant and sustainable value to increasing the jurisdiction's scientific competitiveness at the national or regional level.

## **Eligibility Information**

### **Who May Submit Proposals:**

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of higher education (PhD-granting and non-PhD-granting), acting on behalf of their faculty members, that are accredited in and have a campus in the United States, its territories, or possessions.
  - Distinct academic campuses within multi-campus systems (e.g., campuses that award their own degrees and have independent administrative structures, admissions policies, and alumni associations) qualify as separate submission-eligible institutions.
  - Campuses that plan to submit a proposal through the Sponsored Projects Office of other campuses or organizations should contact NSF EPSCoR to discuss eligibility as early as possible and at least six weeks before submitting such a proposal.
- Non-profit, non-degree-granting domestic U.S. organizations, acting on behalf of their employees, that include (but are not limited to) independent museums and science centers, observatories, research laboratories, professional societies, and similar organizations that are directly associated with the Nation's research or educational activities. These organizations must have an independent, permanent administrative organization (e.g., an office of sponsored research) located in the United States, its territories, or possessions, and have 501(c)(3) tax status.
- Tribal Governments with the governing body of any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe under the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a, et seq.) or Indigenous communities that are not recognized by the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a, et seq.).

E-RISE proposals may only be submitted by organizations within jurisdictions meeting the [EPSCoR eligibility criteria](#).

E-RISE proposals may not be submitted by organizations that serve as the lead organization on a current E-RISE or RII Track-1 award, unless that award is in its final year or under a no-cost extension and will not be renewed. However, individuals employed by said organizations may serve as funded project participants or collaborators in roles other than PI or co-PI on an E-RISE proposal submitted by another organization within the jurisdiction. Such engagement must not be duplicative of currently funded activities, including current EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement awards.

E-RISE submissions should be multi-institutional or multi-organizational, with a lead organization and additional collaborating partner(s), which may include academic and non-academic organizations. E-RISE collaborations must be indicative of building a jurisdiction-wide network of expertise in the chosen research topic.

NSF encourages the participation of the following types of organizations as lead organization and/or collaborative partners in E-RISE submissions:

- Emerging Research Institutions, defined in 42 § USC 18901 as institutions of higher education with an established undergraduate or graduate program that have less than \$50,000,000 in Federal research expenditures within the year of the most currently available data;
- Institutions of higher education that are described in the section "Broadening Participation in STEM" above.

Collaborations with other EPSCoR jurisdictions, non-EPSCoR jurisdictions, and international entities are allowed provided there is appropriate justification outlining a critical need that cannot be fulfilled in the home jurisdiction. However, since EPSCoR funds may only be allocated for activities and personnel within an EPSCoR jurisdiction, participation of collaborators in non-EPSCoR jurisdictions must be as unfunded collaborators.

#### **Who May Serve as PI:**

Principal Investigators must hold at least 50% appointments in eligible organizations within an EPSCoR jurisdiction.

Each collaborating organization must be represented by a PI, co-PI, or other senior/key personnel.

#### **Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization: 1**

Only one submission per organization is allowed where the organization serves as the lead either on a single proposal with subawards or as the lead on a set of separately submitted collaborative proposals. An organization may be the lead on only one E-RISE award. There is no limit on the number of submissions per jurisdiction.

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

An individual may serve as PI or co-PI on only one RII Track-1 award, E-RISE submission, or E-RISE award at any given time (unless an existing RII Track-1 or E-RISE award is in its final year, or in a no-cost extension, and has not been selected for a renewal project award). However, an individual may serve as other senior/key personnel, or in roles other than PI or co-PI, on any number of E-RISE submissions or awards.

### **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](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](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):

August 12, 2025

Second Tuesday in August, Annually Thereafter

### **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**

### **A. EPSCoR Mission and Goals**

The Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR) fulfills the mandate of the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF) to promote scientific progress nationwide. NSF EPSCoR pursues a [mission](#) to enhance the research competitiveness of targeted jurisdictions (state, territory or commonwealth) by strengthening science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) capacity and capability through a diverse portfolio of investments from talent development to local infrastructure. NSF envisions EPSCoR jurisdictions as recognized contributors to the national and global STEM research enterprise.

The goals of NSF EPSCoR are to:

- Catalyze the development of research capabilities and the creation of new knowledge that expands jurisdictions' contributions to scientific discovery, innovation, learning, and knowledge-based prosperity;
- Establish sustainable STEM education, training, and professional development pathways that advance jurisdiction-identified research areas and workforce development;
- Broaden direct participation of individuals, institutions, and organizations in the project's science and engineering research and education initiatives;
- Effect sustainable engagement of project participants and partners, the jurisdiction, the national research community, and the general public through data-sharing, communication, outreach, and dissemination; and

- Impact research, education, and economic development beyond the project at academic, government, and private sector levels.

## **B. EPSCoR and E-RISE Eligibility Criteria**

NSF EPSCoR eligibility is based on a jurisdiction's most recent five-year history of total funds awarded by NSF relative to the Foundation's total research budget for that same period (see EPSCoR [eligibility](#)). An EPSCoR-eligible jurisdiction is defined as a state, U.S. territory, or U.S. commonwealth that previously did not qualify via the established eligibility criteria in any prior year but has become eligible under the current NSF EPSCoR eligibility list. The CHIPS and Science Act ([P.L. 117-167](#)) suspends inclusion of new or graduation of existing EPSCoR jurisdictions through fiscal year 2027. Additional details on EPSCoR eligibility are available on the NSF EPSCoR website (see [RII eligibility](#)).

E-RISE seeks to provide investments in promoting and incubating sustainable research infrastructure and capacity to position teams of researchers in the jurisdiction to be leaders in a STEM topical area at a national and/or international level.

For entities to be eligible to apply for E-RISE funding, the EPSCoR-eligible jurisdiction must demonstrate its commitment to developing its research foundation and improving the quality of STEM research conducted at its universities and colleges by having an active Jurisdictional Steering Committee with current by-laws in place to support jurisdiction-wide STEM research and by having a jurisdictional Science and Technology (S&T) Plan that has been officially accepted and approved by the jurisdiction within the past five years.

## **C. Jurisdictional EPSCoR Steering Committee and Science & Technology (S&T) Plan**

Each jurisdiction is expected to have a single, active, Jurisdictional Steering Committee (although a different name may be used by the jurisdiction). The Jurisdictional Steering Committee is expected to help identify areas of scientific strength and opportunity within the jurisdiction, as well as research infrastructure improvement strategies that will advance the development of sustainable research capabilities within the jurisdiction's research ecosystem. The Jurisdictional Steering Committee is expected to work closely with, and be comprised of, leaders from academic institutions across the jurisdiction, local government, and the private sector. This committee should: (i) aid in both the assessment of the entire research ecosystem present in a jurisdiction and the continuous improvement planning for a jurisdiction's research ecosystem; (ii) identify areas that may be beyond the sphere of influence of current EPSCoR investments within the jurisdiction; and (iii) co-produce, in collaboration with relevant entities in the jurisdiction (e.g. communities, state governments, industry, funded E-CORE projects, and leadership in other jurisdiction-wide federal research investments) the jurisdiction's S&T Plan.

The S&T Plan should establish the jurisdiction-wide research and research infrastructure priorities, including specific goals and objectives, and provide the framework that is expected to guide the jurisdiction's use of R&D infrastructure-improvement resources. The S&T Plan should also be informed by the jurisdiction's economic development priorities and should describe pathways for bringing research outputs and outcomes to the marketplace, where appropriate. The Jurisdictional Steering Committee's work should clearly articulate and address a jurisdiction's needs associated with workforce development, broadening participation in STEM, preparing a K-16 STEM pipeline, and enhancing the economic impact of the jurisdiction's R&D enterprise.

The structure, composition, and appointing authority for the Jurisdictional Steering Committee should be determined by leadership within the jurisdiction and should be based on the specific needs and circumstances of the jurisdiction. As such, the Jurisdictional Steering Committee membership should be reflective of the needs and scope of the jurisdiction and must include the expertise to provide a balanced perspective to accomplish, at minimum, the three primary charges described above. To fulfill these charges in an equitable and consistent manner, each jurisdiction should have a single Jurisdictional Steering Committee. An existing Jurisdictional Steering Committee within a jurisdiction may keep its structure or restructure based on the evolving needs of the jurisdiction. **NSF's expectation is that the membership of the Jurisdictional Steering Committee, along with the current version of the S&T Plan, be publicly available.** Voting and non-voting members of the committee should be clearly indicated.

## **II. Program Description**



## A. E-RISE Goals

NSF EPSCoR investments support and build STEM-driven, jurisdiction-wide research activities and incubators with the potential to position the team to be nationally and internationally competitive within a chosen research field. The E-RISE program is designed to provide EPSCoR-eligible jurisdictions with funding to support the ability to competitively engage in high quality research in a scientific field. It also incubates novel, leading-edge ideas that will lead to increased research capacity and competitiveness in the topical area and sustainable improvements in the jurisdiction's academic research infrastructure and human networks related to the chosen topical area. E-RISE projects should include of the breadth of institutions in the jurisdiction, including primarily undergraduate institutions, two-year institutions, and minority-serving institutions, and also link to any NSF active areas of support.

E-RISE aims to support EPSCoR-eligible jurisdictions to:

1. Build a jurisdiction-wide network of teams of researchers and sectors that conduct and develop high-quality research in a defined STEM disciplinary area or topic of choice that is aligned with jurisdictional priority areas and EPSCoR's mission and goals.
2. Develop high quality hypothesis or problem-driven research projects, including projects that explore emerging or interdisciplinary research areas with high potential impact, and that will sustain project outcomes beyond the E-RISE funding.
3. Develop effective STEM education and workforce development opportunities within the research topic(s) that engage a breadth of audiences across the jurisdiction and establish meaningful partnerships at the individual and institutional levels both within the jurisdiction and beyond.

E-RISE projects are intended to result in sustainable infrastructure in a jurisdiction that positions research teams to be leaders in a STEM topical area at a national and/or international level.

## B. Key Elements of E-RISE Projects

E-RISE proposals must detail alignment with EPSCoR goals. The project's topical area should be identified and justified by leveraging an assessment of a jurisdiction's needs, challenges and opportunities, the strengths of the proposing team and the jurisdiction's priorities. Those priorities are typically identified in the jurisdiction's S&T Plan, but may also be drawn from other jurisdiction plans, reports, or publications prepared by appropriate authorities or bodies, especially in cases where a jurisdiction's S&T plan has not yet been revised to include research infrastructure priorities.

E-RISE projects should be designed using the six key elements outlined below.

### **1) Building of a jurisdiction-wide network of individuals, institutions, and organizations to develop high-quality research aligned with jurisdictional scientific priority areas and the EPSCoR mission and goals**

The focused research topic of a submission must include a comprehensive and integrative approach that aligns a scientific area of significant regional or jurisdictional importance and an area of recognized national or global interest. Proposals should present high quality hypothesis-driven or problem-driven projects that will contribute to the field and that will prepare the E-RISE network for success beyond the award period. A track record of prior collaboration with proposed collaborators is not required, but there is an expectation that project teams will be representative of individuals with recognized expertise in the topic area and of individuals with a history of successfully collaborating.

To align with jurisdiction scientific priorities, a successful project will have a cohesive and evolving plan that details intended engagement with the jurisdiction's E-CORE team(s) and with other existing E-RISE teams. Project teams must include a networking/partnership manager who will manage project administration and coordinate communications, outreach, and other engagement efforts with the jurisdiction.

### **2) Collaborative engagement across different institution types and sectors**

E-RISE projects must demonstrate meaningful collaboration and engagement such that all team members are valued and welcomed, creatively contribute, and gain mutual benefit from participating. Such efforts are essential for increasing capacity across institution types, retaining the STEM workforce within research ecosystems and for scaling the innovation, creativity and productivity of research ecosystems. E-RISE projects should include and leverage individuals that represent the collective intellectual capacity of the jurisdiction regardless of institution type (e.g., research-intensive institutions, emerging research institutions, primarily undergraduate institutions, minority-serving institutions, two-year colleges) or sector (e.g., non-academic, government, industry). There should be a plan to gather feedback from participants that allows the project leadership to assess its progress and adjust as needed to continuously improve efforts to ensure collaboration and engagement. Submissions must document substantive partnerships that are clear, deep, and meaningful and contribute directly to a collaboration that is well-positioned to produce outcomes that leverage the research capacity of an entire jurisdiction.

In cases where jurisdictions may have limited expertise or resources to support needs in the area, collaboration with additional EPSCoR jurisdictions is allowable, providing the proposing team can justify the need and how the collaboration benefits the home jurisdiction. Likewise, non-EPSCoR and international collaborations may be included with appropriate justification, but EPSCoR funds may not be directed to non-EPSCoR entities or organizations.

### **3) Development of a skilled workforce that is relevant to the project and its outcomes (Workforce Development)**

E-RISE projects should include development of innovative formal and/or informal educational plans to prepare a skilled workforce, at multiple levels (e.g., K-12, two-year college, undergraduate, graduate, university faculty), driven by the future education, workforce development, and labor market needs relevant to the E-RISE proposal's research topic. Furthermore, in response to the anticipated needs of the future workforce, projects should develop strong educational programs in the proposed research areas that can be implemented across institutions of higher learning and directly contribute to building a skilled workforce in research topics associated with the proposal.

### **4) Incorporation of use-inspired perspectives and societal impact (SI)**

E-RISE projects should include components that address explicit connection of the research to its end use, and how this directly connects to innovation and policy, which in turn leads to societal impact. Projects should reflect on all aspects of the project goals and implementation to remain attentive to and mitigate potential adverse societal impacts of the project. Projects should enable the convergence of multidisciplinary teams, including social scientists, that span innovation research to understand and build the science, scale it up, and orient it within the perspective of socio-economic implications.

### **5) Building of a pathway to project sustainability**

In the third year of the E-RISE award, the project team will be eligible to apply for a renewal project award for an additional three-years of support. The three-year renewal project award will be made based on the project's overall performance to date, satisfactory progress against the project's strategic plan, and the feasibility and potential impact of activities proposed for the renewal project period. E-RISE projects should provide a clear and well-defined pathway toward sustainability and research capacity for the team and the project that extends beyond the initial project award period, as well as beyond the potential renewal award period. The project should identify specific strategies for identifying both existing and emerging priority areas, innovative approaches to securing necessary financial support, and creativity in leveraging other NSF, federal, state, and private resources.

### **6) Development of a continual improvement cycle**

E-RISE projects should provide a project-wide embracement of a cycle of continual process improvement. To facilitate continued assessment, each E-RISE project must include an independent (to the project) evaluator that is able to assess progress towards all project elements outlined above. Additionally, it is strongly recommended that proposals include a preliminary timetable or Gantt chart for achieving project goals, and that proposals include a logic model with a clearly articulated theory of change that identifies appropriate indicators of progress toward the

desired outcomes. If awarded, the project will create a comprehensive Strategic Plan that will be used to identify when project milestones and goals are met and the resulting outcomes. The final Strategic Plan will need to be approved by NSF. Outputs and outcomes will be assessed yearly by the project team and, if needed, connections may be made in consultation with NSF and subsequently incorporated into a revised Strategic Plan. Activities and products described by the Strategic Plan will be reported through the EPSCoR Data Outcomes Collection System (EDOCS). Even though the award will be initially made for four years, each year's funding increment is dependent on progress towards the goals of the project and mitigation to challenges encountered as demonstrated through the continuous improvement cycle and reported through annual reporting to NSF EPSCoR.

### **C. Renewal Project Proposals**

Funded E-RISE projects will be allowed to submit a proposal for a single three-year renewal award by initiating the process in the third year of the initial E-RISE award. Renewal project proposals are accepted on any date (no deadline) but must be submitted no later than the end of the fourth quarter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the original E-RISE award. Per the PAPPG, this submission window must occur at least six months before additional funding is required or consistent with an established deadline, target date or submission window.

The process for a renewal project award requires submission of a renewal project annual report and a renewal project proposal, as well as a renewal project site visit, as detailed in the guidance provided on the [EPSCoR Annual Reporting Website](https://new.nsf.gov/funding/initiatives/epscor/annual-reporting) (<https://new.nsf.gov/funding/initiatives/epscor/annual-reporting>). See PDF documents at the bottom of the page entitled, "*Guidelines for Preparing E-CORE RII and E-RISE RII Annual and Renewal Reports*" and "*E-CORE RII and E-RISE RII Renewal Site Visit Guidelines*."

Renewal project awards will be based on the quality of the submitted proposal, progress towards stated project goals as outlined in the NSF-approved Strategic Plan, and the development of clear pathways to sustainability of the research and the research network beyond the initial award period, as assessed through merit review and the outcomes of the Renewal Project Site Visit.

While committed cost sharing is not allowed for the initial four-year E-RISE period, cost share is required for the subsequent three-year renewal project, as detailed in "Section 5.1 Renewal Cost-Share Requirements" section of the "*Guidelines for Preparing E-CORE and E-RISE Annual and Renewal Reports*" document. Cost sharing for a renewal project award is required at the level of 20% of the total amount requested from NSF in the renewal project's budget. For collaborative projects with multiple proposals, the cost share amount can either be provided solely by the lead institution or the 20% can be distributed across all budgets in the collaboration.

### **D. Planning Proposal**

Planning proposals to support future E-CORE submissions may be submitted at any time in accordance with the guidance in Chapter II.F.1 of the NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG) and the Dear Colleague Letter NSF 24-097, but such proposals are not required prior to the submission of an E-CORE proposal.

## **III. Award Information**

**Anticipated Funding Amount:** \$31,500,000

Up to \$31,500,000 annually, to support up to 15 newly funded E-RISE awards. Number of awards is approximate and subject to the availability of funds and quality of the proposals submitted.

Funding requests must be for a duration of four (4) years, with a maximum budget \$8,000,000 total for four years and the potential for a renewal project award with a maximum budget of \$4,500,000 total for an additional three (3) years. Within the maximum award budget, there is no restriction on the amount requested annually. When applicable, renewal project awards will only be made subsequent to the closure of the original award.

Note that in only rare and exceptional circumstances will no-cost extensions of the initial award or the renewal project award be granted beyond the grantee-approved no-cost extension.

NSF EPSCoR support of a proposed Research Infrastructure Improvement activity should not duplicate other available federal, jurisdictional, or institutional resources and should add significant and sustainable value to increasing the jurisdiction's scientific competitiveness at the national or regional level.

#### **IV. Eligibility Information**

##### **Who May Submit Proposals:**

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of higher education (PhD-granting and non-PhD-granting), acting on behalf of their faculty members, that are accredited in and have a campus in the United States, its territories, or possessions.
  - Distinct academic campuses within multi-campus systems (e.g., campuses that award their own degrees and have independent administrative structures, admissions policies, and alumni associations) qualify as separate submission-eligible institutions.
  - Campuses that plan to submit a proposal through the Sponsored Projects Office of other campuses or organizations should contact NSF EPSCoR to discuss eligibility as early as possible and at least six weeks before submitting such a proposal.
- Non-profit, non-degree-granting domestic U.S. organizations, acting on behalf of their employees, that include (but are not limited to) independent museums and science centers, observatories, research laboratories, professional societies, and similar organizations that are directly associated with the Nation's research or educational activities. These organizations must have an independent, permanent administrative organization (e.g., an office of sponsored research) located in the United States, its territories, or possessions, and have 501(c)(3) tax status.
- Tribal Governments with the governing body of any Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe under the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a, et seq.) or Indigenous communities that are not recognized by the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a, et seq.).

E-RISE proposals may only be submitted by organizations within jurisdictions meeting the [EPSCoR eligibility criteria](#).

E-RISE proposals may not be submitted by organizations that serve as the lead organization on a current E-RISE or RII Track-1 award, unless that award is in its final year or under a no-cost extension and will not be renewed. However, individuals employed by said organizations may serve as funded project participants or collaborators in roles other than PI or co-PI on an E-RISE proposal submitted by another organization within the jurisdiction. Such engagement must not be duplicative of currently funded activities, including current EPSCoR Research Infrastructure Improvement awards.

E-RISE submissions should be multi-institutional or multi-organizational, with a lead organization and additional collaborating partner(s), which may include academic and non-academic organizations. E-RISE collaborations must be indicative of building a jurisdiction-wide network of expertise in the chosen research topic.

NSF encourages the participation of the following types of organizations as lead organization and/or collaborative partners in E-RISE submissions:

- Emerging Research Institutions, defined in 42 § USC 18901 as institutions of higher education with an established undergraduate or graduate program that have less than \$50,000,000 in Federal research expenditures within the year of the most currently available data;

- Institutions of higher education that are described in the section "Broadening Participation in STEM" above.

Collaborations with other EPSCoR jurisdictions, non-EPSCoR jurisdictions, and international entities are allowed provided there is appropriate justification outlining a critical need that cannot be fulfilled in the home jurisdiction. However, since EPSCoR funds may only be allocated for activities and personnel within an EPSCoR jurisdiction, participation of collaborators in non-EPSCoR jurisdictions must be as unfunded collaborators.

#### **Who May Serve as PI:**

Principal Investigators must hold at least 50% appointments in eligible organizations within an EPSCoR jurisdiction.

Each collaborating organization must be represented by a PI, co-PI, or other senior/key personnel.

#### **Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization: 1**

Only one submission per organization is allowed where the organization serves as the lead either on a single proposal with subawards or as the lead on a set of separately submitted collaborative proposals. An organization may be the lead on only one E-RISE award. There is no limit on the number of submissions per jurisdiction.

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

An individual may serve as PI or co-PI on only one RII Track-1 award, E-RISE submission, or E-RISE award at any given time (unless an existing RII Track-1 or E-RISE award is in its final year, or in a no-cost extension, and has not been selected for a renewal project award). However, an individual may serve as other senior/key personnel, or in roles other than PI or co-PI, on any number of E-RISE submissions or awards.

#### **Additional Eligibility Info:**

For entities to be eligible to submit a proposal for E-RISE funding, the EPSCoR-eligible jurisdiction must demonstrate its commitment to developing its research foundation and improving the quality of STEM research conducted at its universities and colleges by having an active Jurisdictional Steering Committee with current by-laws in place to support jurisdiction-wide STEM research and by having a jurisdictional Science and Technology (S&T) Plan that has been officially accepted and approved by the jurisdiction within the past five years.

## **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](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](mailto: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](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](mailto: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.

**The following instructions are specific to proposals submitted to the EPSCoR Research Incubators for STEM Excellence (E-RISE) competition and supplement the NSF PAPPG and NSF Grants.gov Application Guide:**

- E-RISE proposals may only be submitted by organizations in eligible EPSCoR jurisdictions listed in Section IV of this solicitation. Only one submission per organization is allowed where the organization serves as the lead either on a single proposal with subawards or as the lead on a set of separately submitted collaborative proposals. An organization may be the lead of only one E-RISE award. There is no limit on the number of submissions per jurisdiction.

**Proposal Set-Up:** Select "Prepare New Full Proposal" in Research.gov. Search for and select this solicitation title in Step One of the Full Proposal wizard. In the proposal details section, select "Single proposal (with or without subawards)" or "Separately submitted collaborative proposal". The project title must begin with "E-RISE: " and follow with an informative title in the topic area.

**1. Senior/Key Personnel.** The lead PI must be a researcher from the submitting jurisdiction.

**2. Project Summary.** In accordance with the guidance in the NSF PAPPG, the Project Summary must include three separate sections labeled Overview, Intellectual Merit, and Broader Impacts.

In the Overview section, name all collaborating organizations and briefly describe: the vision and goals of the collaboration; the research objectives and methods to be employed; expected jurisdiction-wide impacts of the proposed activities; and plans for sustaining collaborations and impacts beyond the award period.

In the Intellectual Merit section, describe the intellectual merit of the proposed research.

At the end of the Broader Impacts section, provide five keywords or key phrases that describe the proposal research topic, and the NSF Directorate(s), Division(s), and Program(s) that most closely align with the proposal's research focus.

**3. Project Description.** (20 pages maximum). This section should present the proposed activities in a clear, compelling way and describe how the activities will lead to a sustainable research network beyond the award period. In addition to the requirements contained in the NSF PAPPG, the Project Description must contain the following subsections with supporting detail and articulate clear plans for each subsection described below. PIs are reminded that the Project Description must also include a separate section labeled Broader Impacts.

**I. Research and Capacity-Building Goals and Vision.**

**A. Overview:** Describe the status of the jurisdiction's academic research and development (R&D) enterprise with respect to the chosen research topic, including the strengths, barriers, and opportunities for development of the academic institutions in support of overall R&D objectives. The proposal narrative should provide a convincing, evidence-based rationale for the project's scientific topic and vision, and indicate how the overall strategy, proposed implementation mechanisms, and infrastructure support will mitigate identified

barriers and improve academic research competitiveness in the topic area. The discussion in this section must explicitly describe alignment of the proposed research topic with the STEM research priorities of the jurisdictional S&T Plan or as drawn from other plans, reports, or publications prepared by appropriate authorities or bodies.

**B. Vision:** The project's Research, Education, and Incubator Vision components are the focal point from which all other project elements derive. This section of the proposal should provide a concise description of the long-term research goals for the project and the jurisdiction over the potential 7-year funding period, and the short-term research goals to be accomplished in the first four-year funding period. It should provide clarity on the scientific expertise and equipment that are already available in the jurisdiction. Project goals will include a vision for the development of the research to support growth and development across the breadth of the project. This section should also provide a concise description of the education goals and intellectual focus in sufficient detail to enable their intellectual merit and broader impacts to be assessed.

**C. Research:** The proposal must present the proposed research in the context of other efforts in the field (with appropriate references), state the major challenges and how they will be addressed, and comment on the novelty/originality of the proposed approach. This section of the narrative must contain sufficient detail regarding the scientific hypotheses or research problems, goals, and research methods (laboratory, field, theoretical, computational, or other) for reviewers to assess the rationale, feasibility, and potential impact. Elements of capacity building should be threaded throughout this section, including a summary of the new (additional) expertise and equipment that potentially would be acquired in order to do the proposed work. In addition, this section should provide the grounding for the future of the project past the award period.

Proposals must include a use-inspired and/or social perspective as part of the research component, with discussion of the resulting potential societal implications. It is expected that projects will reflect on all aspects of the project goals and implementation to remain attentive to, and mitigate, potential adverse societal impacts of the project. This includes the explicit connection of the research to its end use and how this directly connects to innovation and policy which in turn leads to societal impact. Innovative use of cyberinfrastructure and other technologies to broadly engage institutions, organizations, and sectors across the jurisdiction is encouraged.

A suggested length for this section of the research description is 7 to 9 pages.

**D. Workforce Development:** Projects must include specific STEM education and workforce development activities that are integrated with the research goals of the project and contribute to the preparation of a competitive workforce appropriate to the chosen research topic. Where appropriate, baseline data should be provided to give context for the impacts of the planned activities. Plans can include opportunities for faculty development (particularly for early-career faculty) and/or for student training (which may occur at any level of the STEM education continuum). The proposal should describe mentoring and professional development of students, junior or postdoctoral researchers, and early-career faculty. **Efforts that focus on pre-college education should describe the basis for their inclusion and their relevance to the research.** The narrative should indicate synergies between proposed workforce development activities and other NSF investments in the jurisdiction that focus on strengthening STEM workforce development. This is especially true in relation to any E-CORE awards, as appropriate.

Projects may support the hiring, retention, and mentoring of new faculty; in these cases, the role(s) of such faculty in the proposed research and capacity building of the E-RISE project must be clearly described.

**E. Jurisdictional Impact and Sustainability:** Projects must provide details of how the project's collaborative efforts will positively impact the jurisdiction in terms of bolstering research capacity and positioning the project team for future success and competitiveness in the chosen research topic. This section also should describe the overall goals for sustaining key outcomes of the project beyond the award period. It should provide a rationale for the goals that are identified and indicate the desired trajectory toward reaching these goals during the first four-year period of the award and beyond, including milestones and timelines. The plans

should explain how the advances in research, education, workforce development realized during the project, and partnerships established/enhanced will serve to advance the S&T competitiveness of the jurisdiction. As appropriate, the section should include future focused plans for the ongoing recruitment and retention of faculty and students, their training and mentoring, and related activities to support their continued career development (such as attending or organizing conferences, workshops, and summer schools). Recognizing that sustaining all project activities may not be possible, the general plans for maintaining impacts into the future should emphasize the project's strategies for identifying priority areas, its innovative approaches to securing necessary financial support, and its creativity in leveraging other NSF, federal, and private resources.

## II. Execution Plan, Evaluation, and Assessment

**A. Execution Plan:** Proposals should include a visual representation (e.g., a figure or Gantt chart) illustrating how the proposed project will be implemented and demonstrating how features of the E-RISE project will be integrated to achieve the proposed vision. In particular, the execution plan should outline the high-level goals within each of the six key elements described above (in Section II. Program Description) and the interrelationships among those goals, as well as the strategic role of partner institutions in achieving these goals. It should identify major milestones and metrics for project success. Finally, the execution plan should articulate the logical reasoning that connects the proposed activities to the identified goals and how they will be connected across the jurisdictional partners.

**B. Evaluation and Assessment Plan:** An independent evaluator, uninvolved in the project development or facilitation of the strategic planning meeting, must conduct annual evaluations and assessment. In addition, quantitative collection of project outcomes is required as part of the EPSCoR Data Outcomes Collection System (EDOCS) inputs and should be used in concert with any additional quantitative or qualitative data collected by the required independent evaluator.

The evaluation and assessment plan must be an integral part of the project design and aligned with the execution plan, as it will serve as a tool for identifying key outcomes, impacts, goals, and objectives. The evaluation and assessment plan should include strategies for formative and summative assessments, including goals, metrics, and milestones, as well as metrics for assessing the strength of the collaboration and workforce development. Finally, it should document how the collaborative efforts evolve over the duration of the award.

## III. Organization and Management

**A. Management Plan and Institutional Contributions:** To properly address the key elements of the E-RISE project, the Leadership Team must include identified individuals with: (a) deep expertise in the fundamental science/engineering areas envisioned by the project; (b) strategic leadership in innovation including intellectual property; (c) expertise in workforce development relevant to the chosen topic; and (d) experience in leading efforts for broadening participation. Proposals must include a management plan that describes the leadership team, including the networking/partnership manager, and its function, the administration of the project, key personnel, and the role of any advisory committee(s) or executive committee(s). E-RISE proposals should describe the managerial processes used to integrate the team and should include a clear plan on the separation of duties and responsibilities related to the project's overall management and reporting structure, including identification of personnel or groups responsible for each part of the project. Finally, proposals should describe the contribution of each institution given the proposed vision for the E-RISE by discussing the value added by each partner in meeting the key elements of E-RISE projects.

**B. Partnerships, Collaboration, and Engagement:** This section should describe the vision and plans for ensuring participation of all individuals, communities, Tribal Nations, and institution types that are representative of the jurisdiction in the E-RISE project. Plans should include a description of how the project will foster engagement of all E-RISE participants, including those from a range of scientific backgrounds and training, and those from groups that are historically underserved or underrepresented in a jurisdiction's research ecosystem and in STEM. This section also should describe (i) plans for recruiting, mentoring, and



retention; (ii) intentional, evidence-based efforts to ensure integration of participants throughout the entire project; and (iii) planned efforts to ensure a culture of collaboration and engagement that is reflected within the project's processes, policies, and procedures. This section should include evidence-based and intentional programming to support a culture that integrates with the entire E-RISE project. Suitable metrics to assess the E-RISE project's partnership and engagement goals should be described, and feedback loops should be in place for independent assessment and continuous improvement in all dimensions of the E-RISE operation. This section should also include a description of plans for recruiting, mentoring, and retaining undergraduates, graduate students, and members of the research and leadership team from groups that are representative of the demographic groups across the jurisdiction.

#### **IV. Results from Relevant Prior Support**

Describe results from relevant prior NSF support and other prior federal or other investments of the PI and co-PIs in the last five years. This section should include a description of the activities and impacts of relevant previous NSF awards, including major accomplishments in both intellectual merit and broader impacts towards the chosen scientific topic of the project.

#### **4. Budget and Budget Justification.**

A four-year cumulative budget will be automatically generated by Research.gov or Grants.gov. Separate budget and budget justification pages must also be provided for each organization receiving a subaward. All faculty-level and equivalent personnel expected to receive greater than two months of salary annually must be identified, and justification must be provided. Support for all members of the project leadership team, including the project manager must be included in the budget.

Budgets should account for travel and contracting expenses required for participation in NSF EPSCoR award monitoring, oversight activities, and national or jurisdictional EPSCoR events. In particular:

- The independent evaluator must be retained as a consultant to the project.
- Newly awarded E-RISE projects are required to hold a strategic planning meeting within 90 days of the project award date. Funds should be allocated to host this meeting, with the entire leadership team in attendance.
- An independent facilitator to manage post-award strategic planning and continuous improvement activities may be provided as a consultant to the project.
- E-RISE projects are expected to engage with other E-RISE and E-CORE projects in the jurisdiction as part of the effort to build a sustainable research ecosystem. Funds may be allotted to support a networking/partnership manager who will manage and coordinate communications, outreach, and other engagement efforts.
- E-RISE projects seeking renewal project awards will be required to host a Renewal Project Site Visit in Project Year 3. Funds should be allocated to ensure an appropriate team of project participants can attend the Renewal Project Site Visit, and to provide meeting space for the Renewal Project Site Visit.
- The travel budget should include funds for an appropriate team of project participants to attend annual EPSCoR PI meetings and the biennial National EPSCoR Conference.
- Funds must be included in the budget to participate in jurisdiction-wide meetings in the home jurisdiction, such as EPSCoR all-hands workshops and/or science symposia, that include support for students (undergraduate and graduate as appropriate) participants and postdoctoral fellows of the E-RISE project.
- E-RISE projects are required to hold all-hand meetings, at least biennially in years 2 and 4 of the project award, that will convene key project stakeholders, including undergraduate and graduate students, project team members, and non-academic partners, to share project updates and foster collaboration. The lead institution must allocate funds to host such meetings and partnering institutions must allocate funds for travel and attendance of participating students, faculty, and project leadership/support staff.
- Subawards to other organizations within the jurisdiction, including lead institutions for existing RII Track-1, E-CORE, or E-RISE awards, may be included to facilitate communication and collaboration. However, justification

must be provided to ensure that these subawards will not duplicate existing EPSCoR-funded effort.

- See Section V.B. below for additional information and guidance.

**5. Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources.** Provide a description of relevant available facilities, equipment, and other resources relevant to the project for each organization in the collaboration.

#### **6. Senior/Key Personnel Documents.**

Biographical Sketches. In accordance with the guidance contained in the PAPPG, a separate biographical sketch must be provided for each individual designated as senior/key personnel on the project. It is permitted to include biographical sketches for any named collaborators ("Other Personnel") whose expertise is crucial to the success of the project, including the independent evaluator(s). If doing so, these biographical sketches must be uploaded in the Other Personnel Biographical Information section in Research.gov and they must conform to NSF guidelines for biographical sketches. Biographical sketches for members of External Advisory Committees or Boards should not be included.

#### **7. Supplementary Documentation.**

In addition to the requirements contained in the PAPPG, the following items must be provided as supplementary documents:

##### 7.1. Lists of Participants and Participating Organizations.

a. List of Participants. Provide an alphabetical (by last name) list of all participating senior investigators (faculty level and equivalent), anyone named in the proposal who will receive financial support through the project (including subcontractors), and other key personnel (including advisory board members, independent evaluators, and collaborators). This list must identify the roles of participants as follows:

- PI: the Principal Investigator of the project as indicated on the Cover Sheet;
- Co-PI: co-investigator as indicated on the Cover Sheet;
- Funded: any funded participant whose name appears in the proposal including Budget lines A or B;
- Evaluator: any individual independent evaluator who is named in the proposal;
- Consultant: any named individual (other than the independent evaluator(s)), who will receive a subcontract or consultant fees under budget lines G.3 or G.6;
- Advisory: any individual named in the proposal as an advisor to the project including as a member of an external advisory board; and
- Unfunded: any collaborator or participant named in the proposal with a specified role but who will not receive salary or other payment.

b. *List of Participating Organizations.* Provide a list of all organizations (including, but not limited to: academic and research institutions, companies, government agencies, and non-profit organizations) that will participate in, contribute to, or directly benefit from the proposed project. This list must identify the roles of the participating organizations as follows:

- Primary award recipient(s): the submitting organization as indicated on the Cover Sheet if submitting as a "Submission of a collaborative proposal from one organization," or as indicated on the Cover Sheets of each Cover Sheet submission if submitting as a "Submission of a collaborative proposal from multiple organizations";
- Subawardee: any organization funded through a subaward on budget line G.5;
- Subcontractor: any organization that will contract with the project through budget line G.3 or G.6, including the independent evaluators if the contract will go to an organization; and,
- Unfunded: any organization named in the proposal that will provide facilities or support including access to laboratory equipment or internships, but which will not receive funding or other payment.

- Give the full name and place of business (city, state) of all such organizations. List only those organizations that are named and have roles specified in the proposal.
- Examples for the lists of participants and participating organizations:
  - Person A from institution X will provide data and assist in analyses but will not be funded by the project. Person A is named in the proposal and the role is described – list person A as a participant (collaborator); do not list X as a participating organization.
  - Organization Y, which will not receive any funds from the project, submits a letter, via person B, committing specific resources to the project (such as internships or use of lab space) – list Y as a participating organization (unfunded); if person B has a role in providing this support, specified either in the proposal or the letter, then list person B as a participant (unfunded), otherwise do not.
  - Person C, affiliated with organization Z, is the independent evaluator for the project and is named in the proposal. List person C as a participant (evaluator). If person C will be compensated via organization Z, then also list Z as a participating organization (subcontractor), otherwise do not.

#### 7.2. Letters of Collaboration.

Letters of support are not allowed, as collaboration roles and involvement should be detailed in the Project Description. However, up to five letters of collaboration (two pages or fewer) from partners or jurisdictional officials may be submitted in the Other Supplementary Documents section to confirm commitments of resources beyond the core project investigators. Please see the NSF PAPPG for guidance on Seeking and Obtaining Tribal Nation Approval for Proposals that May Impact Tribal Resources or Interests.

#### 7.3. Science & Technology Plan.

Submit a copy of the jurisdiction's current S&T Plan in the Other Supplementary Documents section. The plan must have been officially approved within the past five years by the Jurisdictional Steering Committee or a governing authority acting on behalf of the jurisdiction. Evidence of official acceptance or approval by the designated body or official, including the effective date and signature(s) of the approver(s), must be clearly indicated, either in the S&T Plan itself or via an official document (or letter) uploaded separately as a Supplementary Document. In addition, the effective date of the S&T plan must be clearly indicated on the cover page of the plan. Note that no named approver of the jurisdiction's S&T Plan may serve as a named participant on the project.

7.4. Notification to Jurisdictional Steering Committee of Planned Submission. Proposers are required to provide the Jurisdictional Steering Committee notice of their intent to submit an E-RISE proposal prior to submission. In the supplementary documentation section of the proposal, submit a copy of the letter that was that provided to the Jurisdictional Steering Committee. No approval or response from the Jurisdictional Steering Committee is required.

## **B. Budgetary Information**

### **Cost Sharing:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

### **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

- Funding requests must be for a duration of four (4) years, with a maximum total budget of \$8,000,000. There is no restriction on the amount requested annually.
- Financial compensation for the independent evaluator(s) must be included in the budget of the submitting organization under NSF budget line G.3 (Consultant Services). No other form of financial compensation for these services will be allowed.
- EPSCoR funding must only be requested for and expended in EPSCoR jurisdictions. EPSCoR funding may not be used to support participants from, or activities in, non-EPSCoR jurisdictions.

- Subawards to organizations in non-EPSCoR jurisdictions are not permitted.
- If the proposal is being submitted as a "Submission of a collaborative proposal from one organization," budgets for participating organizations must be included as subawards to the budget of the submitting organization. Only the budget of the submitting organization may include subawards (i.e., no subawards may appear in the budgets of sub awardee organizations). Each subaward must include a separate budget justification of no more than five pages (see PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.f).
- If the proposal is being submitted as a "Submission of a collaborative proposal from multiple organizations," follow the instructions in PAPPG Chapter II.E.3 regarding budget submissions.
- Proposal budgets must comply with guidance in 2 CFR 200 and the current NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide (PAPPG). Proposing entities are cautioned to ensure that all costs proposed are allowable (allocable, reasonable, and necessary), especially those costs associated with Participant Support (Line F on the Proposal Budget). Costs typically considered to be for entertainment, incentive, or promotional purposes should be sufficiently detailed in the budget justification to support the programmatic relevance and need. In general, costs for entertainment, amusement, advertising/promotional purposes are unallowable and may not be requested. However, among EPSCoR's programmatic goals are emphases on establishing STEM development pathways and broadening participation of diverse groups in STEM, that can include "Bridge" programs designed to prepare high school students for the transition to college. This may include entertainment, amusement, and/or promotional costs related to STEM enrichment activities covering a range of possible career paths or activities focusing on cohort-building and maintaining healthy work-life balance. These categories of activities are consistent with the overall program goal of preparing students for the difficult high school to college transition. This may include residential programs for minor students whose supervisory requirements may require different choices than would be appropriate for adult students. When costs typically considered as entertainment, amusement, and promotion are necessary to accomplish the proposed objectives, they must be included in the budget and justified in the budget justification.

#### **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

Committed cost sharing is not allowed for the new E-RISE awards; however, cost share is required for the E-RISE three-year renewal project awards, as detailed in "Section 5.1 Renewal Cost-Share Requirements" of the "*Guidelines for preparing E-CORE RII and E-RISE RII annual and renewal reports*" document on the [EPSCoR Annual Reporting](#) website. Cost sharing for a renewal project award is required at the level of at least, and no more than, 20% of the total amount requested in the renewal project budget. An explanation of the source, nature, amount, and availability of the required cost sharing must be provided in the budget justification of the Renewal Proposal (see PAPPG Chapter II Section D.2.f.xii and Chapter VII.C) and reported annually using NSF online systems. All [cost sharing](#) must be allowable and allocable to the project as outlined in the NSF PAPPG.

#### **C. Due Dates**

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

August 12, 2025

Second Tuesday in August, Annually Thereafter

#### **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/ProposalPreparation](https://www.research.gov/research-portal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Service/Desktop/ProposalPreparation)

For Research.gov user support, call the Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-381-1532 or e-mail [rgov@nsf.gov](mailto: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/applicants>. 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](mailto: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/](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

Reviewers will also consider the following specific aspects of intellectual merit and broader impacts, as applicable.

### Connection and potential impact of the project to jurisdictional research capacity building and EPSCoR goals

Are there clear plans to engage with existing and new E-CORE team(s) within the jurisdiction that address EPSCoR goals to build critical infrastructure and sustainably enhance research capacity within the jurisdiction? What is the potential of the project to advance the relevant fields of STEM research while simultaneously enhancing jurisdictional research competitiveness and developing jurisdictional research capacity and infrastructure in the topic area of choice? How will the proposed activities contribute to the national and international recognition of the project participants and participating organizations? How will the proposed project contribute to EPSCoR goals and mission? Is the project connected to the needs of the jurisdiction as described by the jurisdiction's S&T plan?

#### **Development of a skilled workforce that is relevant to the project and its outcomes**

What is the potential for the proposed activities to sustain a pathway of highly skilled students and postdoctoral fellows, including those who are traditionally underrepresented in associated disciplines and industries, who can excel in this focus area, and who can succeed in careers in academia and/or industry? What novel and effective ways are proposed to achieve the workforce development goals?

#### **Support of a culture of collaborative engagement of different institution types and sectors (e.g., academia, industry and government)**

How well does the proposal describe how the project will embody and promote a spirit of collaboration and engagement throughout all activities? Are there clear, measurable goals and metrics specified?

#### **Plan towards sustainability and societal impact**

What is the potential of the project to increase the capacity of the participating organizations and capability of project participants to propose and implement research activities in the future? Does the project present a clear plan for sustainability that effectively leverages potential current and future investments that can ultimately allow this team to significantly contribute to the field and jurisdiction over the long term? Does the project present plans that demonstrate the potential and consideration of the realization of societal impacts to the jurisdiction and its stakeholders from its work in a time-bound manner?

#### **Plan for project management, leadership, and partnerships**

Does the proposal provide a reasonable plan for forming a visionary and effective leadership team? Does the proposal describe a well-informed process by which all necessary disciplines, skills, perspectives, and capabilities will be brought together to form an interdependent and multidisciplinary leadership team that can work and communicate effectively? Are the partnering organizations and individuals appropriate for addressing the proposed work? Does the proposal have a set of partners from multiple organizations that have clear, deep and meaningful roles? Does the Evaluation and Assessment Plan provide evidence that each project element will be well executed?

### **B. Review and Selection Process**

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by

Ad hoc Review and/or Panel Review.

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

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell 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)\*; 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](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](mailto: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](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 infrastructure

projects under 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](https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg).

It will be a requirement of the award that the annual or final report must include an estimate of the funds expected to remain unobligated at the end of the current report period, as part of the "Changes/Problems" section ("Changes that have significant impact on expenditures"). If that estimate is greater than 20% of the current year award amount, the PI also must provide a plan and timeline for expenditure of those funds in the annual/final report.

E-RISE recipients will be required to participate in the EDOCS data-collection activity coordinated by NSF EPSCoR and carried out by its designated entity. This activity is intended to facilitate standardized, accurate metrics tracking across projects and across time and to complement the projects' individual evaluation and assessment efforts.

## **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:

- Casonya M. Johnson, telephone: (703)292-2658, email: [casjohns@nsf.gov](mailto:casjohns@nsf.gov)
- Chinonye Whitley, telephone: (703)292-8458, email: [cwhitley@nsf.gov](mailto:cwhitley@nsf.gov)
- Pinhas Ben-Tzvi, telephone: (703) 292-8246, email: [pbentzvi@nsf.gov](mailto:pbentzvi@nsf.gov)
- Lisa C. Cliggett, telephone: (703) 292-2759, email: [lcligget@nsf.gov](mailto:lcligget@nsf.gov)
- Jose Colom-Ustariz, telephone: (703) 292-7088, email: [jcolom@nsf.gov](mailto:jcolom@nsf.gov)
- Andrea Johnson, telephone: (703) 292-5164, email: [ANDJOHNS@nsf.gov](mailto:ANDJOHNS@nsf.gov)
- Hongmei Luo, telephone: (703) 292-8867, email: [hluo@nsf.gov](mailto:hluo@nsf.gov)

- Benjamin J. McCall, telephone: (703) 292-7916, email: [bjmccall@nsf.gov](mailto:bjmccall@nsf.gov)
- Jeanne R. Small, telephone: (703) 292-8623, email: [jsmall@nsf.gov](mailto:jsmall@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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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/recipients 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:(703)292-5111),