NSF 23-504: Biological Anthropology Program - Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (BA-DDRIG)

Program Solicitation

Document Information

Document History
- **Posted:** October 11, 2022
- **Replaces:** NSF 18-504

[View the program page]

National Science Foundation
Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences

Submission Window Date(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

January 16, 2023 - January 26, 2023

July 20, 2023 - July 31, 2023

July 20 - July 31, Annually Thereafter

January 20, 2024 - January 31, 2024

January 20 - January 31, Annually Thereafter

📄 Table Of Contents

Important Information And Revision Notes

New and clarified program and proposal requirements are described in this solicitation:

- Target dates have been changed to submission window dates.
- Additional guidance is provided for the project description section.
- An ethics statement of no more than two pages is required as a supplementary document for all proposals.
- Additional guidance is provided on data management plans, and the program requires that data be shared (barring ethical limitations on sharing) within two years of final data collection.
- A project personnel list spreadsheet must be sent to the program via email in coordination with proposal submission.
- The maximum request for direct costs has been increased from $20,000 to $25,000; indirect costs are in addition to this direct cost amount and are subject to the awardee's current federally negotiated indirect cost rate.

If a student is unsure whether the Biological Anthropology Program is appropriate for a proposal topic, they are encouraged to email a one-page summary of their project to the program officer(s) prior to proposal submission.

Innovating and migrating proposal preparation and submission capabilities from FastLane to Research.gov is part of the ongoing NSF information technology modernization efforts, as described in Important Notice No. 147. In support of these efforts, proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation must be prepared and submitted via Research.gov or via Grants.gov and may not be prepared or submitted via FastLane.

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:

Biological Anthropology Program - Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (BA-DDRIG)

Synopsis of Program:

The Biological Anthropology Program seeks to advance scientific knowledge about the processes that have shaped biological diversity in living and fossil humans and their primate relatives through support of basic research on human and primate evolution, biological variation, and interactions between biology, behavior and culture. The program supports a portfolio of research that demonstrates engagement with biological anthropological and evolutionary theory; includes diverse and interdisciplinary methods in field, laboratory and computational settings; encompasses multiple levels of analysis (e.g., molecular, organismal, population, ecosystem) and time scales from the short-term to evolutionary; and considers the ethical implications and societal impacts of the research. The program also supports a wide range of broader impact activities as part of research grants, including research outcomes with inherent benefit to society, efforts to broaden participation in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) training, research and outreach activities and other evidence-based activities developed within the context of the mission, goals and resources of the organizations and people involved.

The program contributes to the integration of education and basic research through support of dissertation projects conducted by doctoral students enrolled in U.S. universities. This solicitation specifically addresses the preparation and evaluation of proposals for Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (DDRIG). Dissertation research projects in all of the subareas of biological anthropology are eligible for support through these grants. These awards are intended to enhance and improve the conduct of dissertation research by doctoral students who are pursuing research in biological anthropology that enhances basic scientific knowledge.

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.

- Marta P. Alfonso-Durruty, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7811, email: malfonso@nsf.gov

- Rebecca Ferrell, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7850, email: rferrell@nsf.gov

- Angelica T. Brewer, Program Specialist, telephone: (703) 292-4636, email: abrewer@nsf.gov

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

- 47.075 --- Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 25 to 40

It is anticipated that 25 to 40 DDRIG awards will be made per fiscal year.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $600,000 to $800,000

The anticipated funding amount is $600,000 to $800,000 per fiscal year (1 October through 30 September), pending availability of funds.

Project budgets should be developed at scales appropriate for the work to be conducted. Proposal budgets cannot exceed $25,000 in direct costs for the entire duration of the award. Indirect costs are in addition to this direct cost

amount and are subject to the awardee's current federally negotiated indirect cost rate. The maximum project duration is 24 months.

The proposer may concurrently submit a doctoral dissertation proposal to other funding organizations. Please indicate this in the "Current and Pending Support" section of the NSF proposal, so that NSF may coordinate funding with the other organizations.

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

> Proposals may only be submitted by the following:
>
> - Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Ph.D. granting IHEs accredited in, and having a campus located in, the U.S. acting on behalf of their faculty members.

Who May Serve as PI:

> DDRIG proposals must be submitted through regular organizational channels by the dissertation advisor(s) on behalf of the graduate student. The principal investigator (PI) is the faculty member serving as the doctoral student's dissertation advisor and the co-principal investigator (Co-PI) is the doctoral student enrolled at the same U.S. IHE. If appropriate, and at the discretion of the submitting institution, an additional faculty advisor at the same or another institution may be listed as another Co-PI. The doctoral student must be the author of the proposal. At the time of the submission window, doctoral students are expected to be at the appropriate stage of their academic career to enable submission of a finalized dissertation proposal, most typically very near, or having advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

> There are no restrictions or limits.

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

> There is no limitation on the number of DDRIG proposals submitted to the BA Program by an advisor or other faculty member functioning as the PI, either during a particular competition or over the course of their career. Restrictions on the number of proposals submitted to the Senior Biological Anthropology (BA-SR) solicitation do not apply to DDRIGs. A particular doctoral student may submit to the BA Program DDRIG competition twice (original and one resubmission); in rare circumstances, this restriction may be waived at the discretion of a Biological Anthropology program officer. A student may receive only one DDRIG award.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Not required

- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required

- **Full Proposals:**

  - Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) guidelines apply. The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

  - Full Proposals submitted via Grants.gov: *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov* guidelines apply (Note: The *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is

available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at:
https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide).

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

  Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**

  Not Applicable

- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

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

C. Due Dates

- **Submission Window Date(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

  January 16, 2023 - January 26, 2023

  July 20, 2023 - July 31, 2023

  July 20 - July 31, Annually Thereafter

  January 20, 2024 - January 31, 2024

  January 20 - January 31, Annually Thereafter

Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:

National Science Board approved criteria apply.

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

Three anthropological science programs, Archaeology, Biological Anthropology and Cultural Anthropology, are housed in the Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences, part of NSF's Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate. As a group, these programs support basic research that advances anthropological theory, expands our understanding of human cultural and biological variation in the past and present and informs contemporary efforts to improve the human condition. The Biological Anthropology Program focuses specifically on processes that have shaped biological diversity in humans and their living and fossil primate relatives, through support of multifaceted, fundamental research on human and primate evolution, biological variation and adaptation, and interactions between biology and behavior and culture. This solicitation specifically addresses the preparation and evaluation of Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant (DDRIG) proposals submitted to the Biological Anthropology Program. Information regarding other mechanisms of support through Biological Anthropology can be found in the Senior Research Awards solicitation.

II. Program Description

The Biological Anthropology (BA) Program supports a multifaceted portfolio of research on humans and their living and fossil primate relatives that 1) demonstrates engagement with biological anthropological and evolutionary theory, 2) includes diverse, often interdisciplinary methods in field, laboratory and computational settings, 3) encompasses multiple levels of analysis (e.g., molecular, organismal, population, ecosystem) and time scales from the short-term to evolutionary and 4) considers the ethical implications and societal impacts of the research.

BA-DDRIG proposals are accepted in all of the research areas encompassed by the Biological Anthropology Program and may use any of the diversity of research approaches to investigations within the discipline. It is expected that the research, whether hypothesis- or discovery-driven, will have a strong conceptual foundation and contribute to the advancement of theory and knowledge in biological anthropology beyond that of the highly-focused research topic.

BA-DDRIG proposals may be considered for co-review with other programs that have DDRIG competitions. Often, proposals with a biocultural or bioarchaeological orientation are appropriate for co-review with the Cultural Anthropology or Archaeology Programs, respectively. A request for co-review should be made only when the PIs believe the proposed work makes a strong case for advancing theory and basic knowledge in multiple communities served by multiple programs and when the project description engages literature from those communities. Co-review may be requested by the PIs but ultimately is at the discretion of the participating programs.

NSF does not support research on the etiology, diagnosis or treatment of disease; research focused on basic ecological, biological and behavioral processes that underlie health and disease in humans and non-human primates, however, may be eligible for support in the Biological Anthropology Program. The program does not support applied forensic anthropology research, but projects that demonstrate substantial theoretical or methodological engagement with both bioarchaeology and forensic anthropology may be eligible for support.

A list of recent awards made by the program demonstrates the range of sub-fields, methods and topics typically supported. If a researcher is unsure whether the BA-DDRIG Program and NSF more broadly are appropriate for a proposal topic, they are encouraged to email a one-page summary of their project to the program officer(s) prior to a proposal submission.

The program encourages PIs to consider the full scope of ethical implications that their proposed research has on individuals, communities, environments and the scientific enterprise. The program also supports a wide range of broader impact activities as part of research grants, including research outcomes with inherent benefit to society, student training, efforts to broaden participation in STEM training, research and outreach activities and other evidence-based activities developed within the context of the mission, goals, and resources of the organizations and people involved. The program encourages the use of secondary data in research projects where appropriate. Examples of secondary data sources can include, but are not limited to, shared data resources, such as open-access data repositories, databases, and registries, as well as datasets from ongoing studies and publications.

Proposals for dissertation research are not expected to support the full costs of the student's research. These awards are intended to provide supplemental funds for items not normally available from the student's university or other funding sources. Allowable items include travel to research facilities and field sites distant from the student's institution, costs for data-collection activities integral to the project, purchase of research supplies and services not otherwise available through the institution, the hiring of field or laboratory assistants if warranted by the scope of the research, fees for use of specialized research equipment or research facilities, and research fees imposed for international fieldwork. Funds may not be used for stipends or salary for the doctoral student or their advisor(s), tuition, textbooks or journals, dissertation preparation, travel by the faculty advisor to the research site or to professional meetings or travel by the student to professional meetings.

DDRIG awards may be for one or two years in duration, with all costs to be covered by received funds reimbursed during this award period. Proposals may request up to $25,000 in direct costs. In addition, proposals submitted in response to this solicitation are subject to the awardee's current federally-negotiated indirect cost rate. PIs are requested to ensure that utilization of the on-campus/off-campus rates for calculation of indirect costs is appropriate to the conduct of the

proposed research and in conjunction with negotiated and institutional policies and procedures for calculation of these indirect costs.

Additional Program Considerations

Broader Impact Activities
The program supports a wide range of broader impact activities, and successful projects will include creative, well-integrated, effective, evidence-based broader impact activities as appropriate to the topic and scale of research and the mission, goals and resources of the organizations and people involved. The expertise of collaborators, the proposal budget and the budget justification should reflect this integration. Example activities include but are not limited to those that create effective methods of science outreach and engagement with local communities or the public at large; translate research to benefit broader societal needs; involve early career researchers and students who are veterans, persons with disabilities or from other groups that are underrepresented in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM); or foster new partnerships, including if focused on capacity building (e.g., with Minority Serving Institutions, two-year colleges or internationally). Additional guidance for broader impacts may be found in the PAPPG and in the Dear Colleague Letter: A Broader Impacts Framework for Proposals Submitted to NSF's Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences Directorate.

Ethics Statement
The field of biological anthropology aspires to continually improve the integration of ethical considerations and practices into research projects. Such considerations could relate to community-engaged research or co-production of knowledge with living populations (e.g., research participants, descendant communities), many of whom are underrepresented in the STEM research enterprise; environmental impact of research; use of vertebrate animals; collection and analysis of human skeletal and biological data; researcher safety; data archiving and sharing, and other issues. The program has therefore instituted a requirement for an ethics statement of no more than two pages for all research proposals, where the PIs can summarize the most salient ethical issues raised by the research and how the research team is approaching them. This document provides space to discuss issues not addressed at length elsewhere in the proposal, as well as to refer to issues that are addressed in other parts of the proposal.

Community Engagement in Research
Community engagement refers to substantive interaction with community partner organizations and anchor institutions such as governments; federal, state and local agencies; schools, libraries, health and social service providers; tribes and Indigenous-serving organizations; nonprofits; cultural organizations; and businesses. Co-production of knowledge includes the integration of different knowledge systems and methodologies to systematically understand the phenomena, systems and processes being studied in a research project. A co-produced approach includes research in which local and Indigenous peoples and organizations fully engage in the complete research process cycle from the development of research questions to the collection, use and stewardship of data and the interpretation, application and dissemination of results.

Proposals that include community engagement, partnerships with communities and international collaboration should either (1) have already established agreed-upon partnerships, documented with the appropriate letters of collaboration and budget allocations, or (2) provide a clear plan for community engagement and partnership building as part of the first year of the grant. Both options must follow best practices in community partnerships, especially if partnerships are to be established with underrepresented communities. Successful proposals will have the appropriate expertise on the PI's team to conduct community-based research, participatory research or place-based research. Sufficient funding should be allocated in the budget to support mutually beneficial and respectful interactions that not only produce meaningful research and education or outreach outcomes, but also focus on the concerns of partnering communities, including questions of data sovereignty, co-authorship or co-review of project outcomes.

Projects Involving Native, Tribal and Indigenous Communities
Proposals that include research in Native or Tribal communities or on Tribal lands must include a letter or email as a supplementary document that confirms community collaboration and/or permission to work on associated lands from the relevant community organizations or tribal leadership (see the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Tribal Directory Assessment tool or the National Congress of American Indians tribal directory). Collaborations should

be well justified, in that they represent true intellectual collaboration and utilize the expertise and specialized skills, facilities and resources of the community. Collaboration with Native, Tribal and Indigenous communities should be reflected in the proposal budget and budget justification, such as through requests for sufficient funding to support the time and travel of Native community members, and through co-authorship on publications and presentations, as appropriate. Arrangements to allocate and share samples and data with the relevant communities should be discussed in the proposal or in the data management plan, following FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) principles for data management and CARE (Collective benefit, Authority to control, Responsibility and Ethics) ⧉ principles for indigenous data governance.

Projects Involving Collaboration with Foreign Organizations or Work in Foreign Countries
As stated in the PAPPG, NSF rarely provides direct funding to support foreign organizations and only provides support for the U.S. portion of collaborative projects. If foreign organization involvement is essential to the project, subawards or consultant arrangements may be considered if the foreign organization contributes unique resources not otherwise available, or significant education, training and/or research opportunities to the U.S. Such information must be provided in the project description section of the proposal. For studies in countries other than the United States, the project description should discuss, where appropriate, collaborations with scientists and students from the host country, and how these individuals will be involved in the project.

Collaborations should be well justified, in that they represent true intellectual collaboration and use the expertise and specialized skills, facilities and resources of the foreign collaborator. Letters of collaboration must be included in the other supplementary documents section of the proposal. Principal investigators are encouraged to provide U.S. students and junior researchers with international research experiences. Where relevant, arrangements to allocate samples and data between host country organizations or institutions and U.S. organizations or institutions should be discussed in the proposal. Investigators are encouraged to include any such permits (including legally required collecting, import and export permits for samples, instrumentation and data), authorizations, and agreements, in the other supplementary documents section of the proposal.

Data Management
As stated in the PAPPG, principal investigators (PIs) are expected to share with other researchers, at no more than incremental cost and within a reasonable time, the data, samples, physical collections and other supporting materials created or gathered in the course of work under NSF grants. The Biological Anthropology Program is committed to the establishment, maintenance, validation, description and distribution of high-quality data sets generated by program-funded projects. Proposals should generate data products that are findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable (FAIR). The Biological Anthropology program requires that data be shared (barring ethical limitations on sharing) within two years of final data collection. See proposal preparation and submission instructions below for additional information.

Plans for the dissemination and sharing of research results will be traceable from the beginning to the end of a project (proposal, review and annual/final report). PIs are required to provide updates on the status of metadata and data archiving in annual and final project reports. See reporting requirements below for additional information.

Permits, Permissions and Collaborations
PIs are responsible for obtaining the required authorizations from federal, state or local authorities for any collecting or other activities and for advising NSF that they have been obtained or requested. The proposal should briefly describe the permits that are required and the timeline for approvals in the supplementary figures and tables document. For proposals that require support from centrally supported facilities, investigators must obtain letters of collaboration from the managing organization that follow the standard text described in the PAPPG, and those letters should be included as a supplementary document.

Field Projects
Field projects must describe the protocol that will be undertaken to ensure the safety of the field party, especially students and others who are inexperienced in working under conditions that can be, at times, uncomfortable, unfamiliar, or threatening. Protocols should incorporate best practices to ensure both physical and emotional safety of all participants and should be uploaded as other supplementary documents.

Human Subjects Research

Projects involving human subjects must indicate this on the cover sheet, including status of IRB approval and federal-wide assurance, and will need to provide Institutional Review Board approval prior to any award being processed (see the PAPPG). Though IRB approval is not required at the time of proposal submission, the program encourages PIs to briefly address the status of approval or the plan for IRB approval in the project description and provide any additional ethical considerations related to human subjects research in the ethics statement supplementary document.

Vertebrate Animal Research

Projects involving vertebrate animals must indicate this on the cover sheet, including status of IACUC approval and PHS Assurance, and must provide IACUC approval and current PHS Assurance information prior to any award being processed (see the PAPPG). Though IACUC approval and PHS Assurance are not required at the time of proposal submission, the program encourages PIs to briefly address the status of approval or plan for vertebrate animals approvals in the project description and discuss any additional ethical considerations related to vertebrate animals research in the ethics statement supplementary document. For proposals with plans for primary data analysis in captive or laboratory animals, PIs are encouraged to discuss in the project description or ethics statement: 1) the Essential 10 items in the ARRIVE Guidelines 2.0 ⬚ (Animal Research: Reporting of In Vivo Experiments) and 2) the 3R principles of Replacement, Reduction and Refinement and how the proposed study can accelerate progress toward meeting these goals.

III. Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 25 to 40

It is anticipated that 25 to 40 DDRIG awards will be made per fiscal year.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $600,000 to $800,000

The anticipated funding amount is $600,000 to $800,000 per fiscal year (1 October through 30 September), pending availability of funds.

Project budgets should be developed at scales appropriate for the work to be conducted. Proposal budgets cannot exceed $25,000 in direct costs for the entire duration of the award. Indirect costs are in addition to this direct cost amount and are subject to the awardee's current federally negotiated indirect cost rate. The maximum project duration is 24 months.

The proposer may concurrently submit a doctoral dissertation proposal to other funding organizations. Please indicate this in the "Current and Pending Support" section of the NSF proposal, so that NSF may coordinate funding with the other organizations.

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

IV. Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Ph.D. granting IHEs accredited in, and having a campus located in, the U.S. acting on behalf of their faculty members.

Who May Serve as PI:

DDRIG proposals must be submitted through regular organizational channels by the dissertation advisor(s) on behalf of the graduate student. The principal investigator (PI) is the faculty member serving as the doctoral student's dissertation advisor and the co-principal investigator (Co-PI) is the doctoral

student enrolled at the same U.S. IHE. If appropriate, and at the discretion of the submitting institution, an additional faculty advisor at the same or another institution may be listed as another Co-PI. The doctoral student must be the author of the proposal. At the time of the submission window, doctoral students are expected to be at the appropriate stage of their academic career to enable submission of a finalized dissertation proposal, most typically very near, or having advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

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

There is no limitation on the number of DDRIG proposals submitted to the BA Program by an advisor or other faculty member functioning as the PI, either during a particular competition or over the course of their career. Restrictions on the number of proposals submitted to the Senior Biological Anthropology (BA-SR) solicitation do not apply to DDRIGs. A particular doctoral student may submit to the BA Program DDRIG competition twice (original and one resubmission); in rare circumstances, this restriction may be waived at the discretion of a Biological Anthropology program officer. A student may receive only one DDRIG award.

V. Proposal Preparation And Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

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

- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.

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

See PAPPG Chapter II.C.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 section lists BA-DDRIG proposal information and requirements that augment the PAPPG standard guidance:

Proposal Set-Up

Select "Prepare New Full Proposal" in Research.gov. Search for and select this solicitation title in Step 1 of the Full Proposal wizard. The information in Step 2, Where to Apply, will be prepopulated by the system. Select "Research" as the proposal type. In the proposal details section, select "Single proposal (with or without subawards). Separately submitted collaborative proposals will be returned without review. The project title must begin with "Doctoral Dissertation

Research:" followed by a succinct, descriptive and jargon-free title of the dissertation research project that emphasizes the generalizable science that the research will address.

Senior Personnel

List the primary dissertation advisor as the PI and list the doctoral student (and other advisors, only if highly appropriate to the conduct of the research) as Co-PI(s).

Cover Sheet

- Please pay careful attention to all PAPPG requirements regarding human subjects and vertebrate animal research (PAPPG II.D.iv&v). This includes listing IRB or IACUC approval status AND ensuring that relevant assurance numbers are provided.

Project Summary

- Researchers should ensure that this one-page document provides sufficient summary information about the research design in the overview section (e.g., types of data and sample sizes, locations of fieldwork, methods of data collection and analysis) so that the reader has a relatively complete picture of the proposed project.

Project Description

- The text of the project description is limited to 10 single-spaced pages. Up to 5 additional pages at the end of the project description can be used for presentation of graphics (non-textual material), including maps, figures and photographs essential to presentation of the project.
- If a proposal is a resubmission, the first paragraph of the project description must summarize how the proposal has been substantially revised and how the PI has responded to previous reviewer concerns.
- The "Results from Prior Support" section is not required.
- The project description should incorporate:
    - The scientific significance of the project and the relevant theoretical framework(s) and literature (including significance of the research to biological anthropology beyond informing the focused area of inquiry, as well as any distinct transformative potential).
    - The research question(s) to be addressed.
    - Details of any student training related to the conduct of the research.
    - Details of any preliminary data.
    - Details of the research design, including samples, power analyses, methods and data analysis.
    - A research timeline.
    - A well-developed broader impacts section. Discussion of the improvement of the co-PI's graduate training can be included, but investigators should go beyond this in delineating impacts generated by the research itself, through activities related to the research, or activities that are supported by, but are complementary to the project. These should be appropriate to the size and scope of the research, and are expected to illustrate that significant thought has been applied to consideration of the impact of the research as it may inform or advance societally-relevant outcomes.

Biosketch

- A separate biographical sketch must be provided through use of an NSF-approved format for each individual designated as senior personnel.
- Synergistic activities must be specific and must not include multiple examples to further describe the activity. Examples with multiple components, such as committee member lists, sub-bulleted highlights of honors and prizes, or a listing of organizations for which the individual has served as a reviewer, are not permitted.

Budget

- Direct costs may not exceed $25,000.

- Permitted budget items include travel to research facilities and field sites distant from the student's institution, costs for data-collection activities integral to the project, purchase of research supplies and services not otherwise available through the institution, the hiring of field or laboratory assistants if warranted by the scope of the research, fees for use of specialized research equipment or research facilities, and research fees imposed for international fieldwork.

- Funds may not be used for stipends or salary for the doctoral student or their advisor(s), tuition, textbooks or journals, dissertation preparation, travel by the faculty advisor to the research site or to professional meetings or travel by the student to professional meetings.

- Since salaries or stipends for the doctoral student or their advisor(s) are not eligible for support, after the PI and Co-PI(s) are entered on the cover sheet, their names must be manually removed from the senior personnel listing on the budget pages. This is to avoid construal as voluntary committed cost sharing, which is not permitted.

Data Management Plan: There are five required sections, as described in the PAPPG. In preparing those sections, PIs should ensure that the following points are addressed:

- Describe what data or samples will be collected, what analyses will be done and how the project will provide open and rapid access to samples, data, derived data products (e.g., models and model output) and other information on the project during and after the project's completion. If there are ethical limitations on the timing or extent of data use or sharing, these limitations should be described.

- Describe plans to make full data sets, derived data products (e.g., model results, output and workflows), software and physical collections publicly accessible within two years of final collection, barring any human subject and other ethical considerations. Some types of data may be considered "final" at different stages of processing in different fields. Thus, PIs should define, in their data management plans, in what state they would consider their data to be final and ready for public access. Any limit on access to data, samples or other information beyond the two-year moratorium period must be based on compelling justification, documented in the data management plan of the proposal or approved by the program director. If the project is not expected to generate new data, samples or derived data products, the data management plan should include a statement that no detailed plan is needed, accompanied by a clear justification.

- For proposals that incorporate fieldwork or new sample collections, describe well-documented plans for fieldwork coordination and permitting, vouchering of new collections, specimen preparation, long-term specimen storage regimes that are openly accessible, specimen identifications and descriptions, georeferencing, data modeling and databasing and rapid dissemination of data into public databases. Where no repository or archive exists for collected data and samples, the PI is required to identify a preservation plan in the data management plan that complies with the general philosophy of sharing research products and data within two years of collection. This could include a museum- or university-hosted repository if that repository is intended for long-term curation.

- In addition, the following are resources that may be helpful:
    - NSF Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate data management guidelines.
    - Mulligan CJ, Boyer DM, Turner TR, Delson E, Leonard WR. 2022. Data sharing in biological anthropology 🔗. Yearbook of Biological Anthropology.
    - American Journal of Biological Anthropology guidelines regarding data sharing 🔗.
    - American Anthropological Association's (AAA) Statement on Professional Ethics 🔗, Sections 5, "Make Your Results Accessible," and 6, "Protect and Preserve Your Records," as well as the AAA's digital data management course modules 🔗.
    - Registry of Anthropological Data Wiki 🔗.

Other Supplementary Documentation

- **Permits, letters of permission and letters of collaboration:** If the dissertation project involves collaboration on the part of individuals or organizations in order to carry-out the activities and achieve the research goals, brief statements (in the form of letters or free-standing email messages) may be included in other supplementary documents section. These must be statements of intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the project description or the facilities, equipment or other resources section of the proposal. Such statements must not be letters of recommendation in support of the project. Letters of collaboration should be limited to stating the intent to collaborate and should not contain endorsements or evaluation of the proposed project. As described in the PAPPG, the recommended format for letters of collaboration is as follows:
    - "If the proposal submitted by Dr. [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] entitled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by NSF, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description or the Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources section of the proposal."

- A **statement on ethics** of no more than two pages is required for all research proposals. Please discuss the most salient ethical issues raised by your research and explain how you are approaching them. We encourage you to think broadly about your ethical obligations to research participants, descendant communities, local stakeholders and others affected by your work. Such considerations could relate to community-engaged research or co-production of knowledge with living populations (e.g., research participants, descendant communities); environmental impact of research; use of vertebrate animals; collection and analysis of human skeletal and biological data; researcher safety; data archiving and sharing, and other issues. For research that involves human skeletal material, researchers may wish to refer to the AJBA guidelines 🔗. This document provides space to discuss issues not addressed at length elsewhere in the proposal, as well as to refer to issues that are addressed in other parts of the proposal.

- **PI/Advisor Statement.** The BA-DDRIG proposal must include a statement from the principal investigator that is uploaded to the other supplementary documents section. The following template must be used to prepare the statement; the only changes permitted are provision of information where there are blank lines in the template. The statement must be signed by the PI.

    Required template for the PI's signed statement:

    To: NSF Biological Anthropology Program

    From: (Printed name of the Principal Investigator)

    I confirm that this proposal, which is entitled, " _____ " is a (delete the one that does not apply)

    First-time submission
    Revised, re-submission.

    By signing below, I affirm that I have read the proposal, and that, barring unforeseen circumstances, the student will be prepared to undertake the research within 12 months of the submission window.

    If this is a resubmission, I also affirm that the proposal has been substantially revised and that it addresses the particular concerns raised by the reviewers of the previous submission.

    Signed:
    Organization:
    Date:

Other Required Documents

- **Project personnel list spreadsheet.** An additional spreadsheet listing all personnel involved in the project **must** be submitted. By "project personnel" we refer to all individuals involved in project activities, regardless of

institutional affiliation or extent or duration of involvement. This spreadsheet is separate from the spreadsheet that lists collaborators and other affiliations (COA) information. Please download the personnel list spreadsheet template and read the instructions carefully. Using the template, compile an Excel file that provides information for all persons identified in the proposal as: "PI or co-PI" (i.e., those listed on the cover sheet), "Other Senior Personnel/Subawardee" or "Other Personnel" who have a biographical sketch included in the proposal, including all international collaborators. Only one spreadsheet should be submitted per project. The file **must** include the proposal ID assigned after submission of your proposal (i.e., not the Temporary ID # or Grants.gov ID #). Once completed, the file should be submitted by email to SBE-BioAnthTemplate@nsf.gov within one business day of proposal submission.

Pre-Submission Proposal Checklist:

- Submitted within the submission window.
- Research proposed matches the areas encompassed by the Biological Anthropology Program.
- Proposal title begins with "Doctoral Dissertation Research:"
- Project summary is one page and contains separate sections for overview, intellectual merit, and broader impacts.
- Project description does not exceed 10 pages, followed by up to 5 additional pages containing only graphics and tables.
- References cited present as a separate section.
- Biographical sketches for the PI and Co-PI(s) are present and comply with the required NSF format.
- Collaborators & other affiliations (COA) Information is included for the PI and Co-PI(s).
- Budget does not list senior personnel names.
- Budget does not exceed $25,000 in direct costs (indirect costs are computed according to negotiated rates and appropriate to institutional policy regarding aspects such as application of on-campus versus off-campus rates).
- Budget does not include items prohibited for BA-DDRIG proposals, as delineated above.
- Budget justification is present and fully delineates and explains the need for the items in the context of the proposed research.
- Current and pending support forms for both PI and Co-PI(s) are present and include the current proposal (the proposal being submitted) under pending support.
- Facilities, equipment and other resources section is included (and if not applicable, text is inserted or a document uploaded in this section that states "Not Applicable").
- Required data management plan is present and thorough with respect to NSF guidelines.
- Signed statement by the PI is included under other supplementary documents and utilizes the required template with no alterations or added text.
- Ethics statement is included and does not exceed two pages.
- Project personnel list spreadsheet should be emailed to SBE-BioAnthTemplate@nsf.gov once the proposal has been submitted and an official proposal number has been generated.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:

Up to $25,000 in direct costs for up to 24 months. There are no indirect costs limitations; proposals submitted in response to this solicitation are subject to the awardee's current federally negotiated indirect cost estimate. Please note that

indirect costs are in addition to the maximum direct cost request of up to $25,000. Restrictions on allowable categories of funding, as described in this solicitation, must be followed.

C. Due Dates

- **Submission Window Date(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

    January 16, 2023 - January 26, 2023

    July 20, 2023 - July 31, 2023

    July 20 - July 31, Annually Thereafter

    January 20, 2024 - January 31, 2024

    January 20 - January 31, 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/ProposalPreparationandSubmission.html. For Research.gov user support, call the Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-673-6188 or e-mail rgov@nsf.gov. The Research.gov Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the Research.gov system. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this funding opportunity.

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once registered, the applicant's organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website. Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage: https://www.grants.gov/web/grants/applicants.html. In addition, the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide (see link in Section V.A) provides instructions regarding the technical preparation of proposals via Grants.gov. For Grants.gov user support, contact the Grants.gov Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or by email: support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Contact Center answers general technical questions related to the use of Grants.gov. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this solicitation.

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

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

VI. NSF Proposal Processing And Review Procedures

Proposals received by NSF are assigned to the appropriate NSF program for acknowledgement and, if they meet NSF requirements, for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an NSF Program Officer, and usually by three to ten other persons outside NSF either as *ad hoc* reviewers, panelists, or both, who

are experts in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with oversight of the review process. Proposers are invited to suggest names of persons they believe are especially well qualified to review the proposal and/or persons they would prefer not review the proposal. These suggestions may serve as one source in the reviewer selection process at the Program Officer's discretion. Submission of such names, however, is optional. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition, Program Officers may obtain comments from site visits before recommending final action on proposals. Senior NSF staff further review recommendations for awards. A flowchart that depicts the entire NSF proposal and award process (and associated timeline) is included in PAPPG Exhibit III-1.

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

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

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

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

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

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

1. Merit Review Principles

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

- All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- NSF projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals. These "Broader Impacts" may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project

activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified.

- Meaningful assessment and evaluation of NSF funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects. If the size of the activity is limited, evaluation of that activity in isolation is not likely to be meaningful. Thus, assessing the effectiveness of these activities may best be done at a higher, more aggregated, level than the individual project.

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

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

2. Merit Review Criteria

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

The two merit review criteria are listed below. **Both** criteria are to be given **full consideration** during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria. (PAPPG Chapter II.C.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.C.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 Plan and the Postdoctoral Researcher Mentoring Plan, as appropriate.

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 applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new awardees may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer's recommendation.

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

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

VII. Award Administration Information

A. Notification of the Award

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

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award notice, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3)

the proposal referenced in the award notice; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (GC-1)*; or Research Terms and Conditions* and (5) any announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award notice. Cooperative agreements also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Financial and Administrative Terms and Conditions (CA-FATC) and the applicable Programmatic Terms and Conditions. NSF awards are electronically signed by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer and transmitted electronically to the organization via e-mail.

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

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

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Build America, Buy America

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

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

C. Reporting Requirements

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

Failure to provide the required annual or final 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 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.

Biological Anthropology Program Annual and Final Reports

Annual and final reports should provide a succinct outline of the specific aims, broader impacts and data management plan as the first entry of the accomplishments section ("What are the major goals of the project?").

PIs are expected to specifically address progress on activities related to proposed broader impacts in annual and final reports. Information should be provided in the accomplishments section under questions about opportunities for training and professional development and dissemination of results to communities of interest. The impacts of these activities should be described in the impacts section, under impacts on society beyond science and technology.

Compliance with the project data management plan must be documented in annual and final reports. Identifiers for archived metadata and data, such as Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs) or persistent URLs, must be included in these reports in the section entitled "Products-Websites." Where the final report is due before the required date of sample or data submission, the PI must report plans for final data or sample submission in the impacts/information resources section. The PI should notify the program director by e-mail after final data and/or sample submission has occurred, even if this is after the end date of the award.

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:

- Marta P. Alfonso-Durruty, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7811, email: malfonso@nsf.gov

- Rebecca Ferrell, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-7850, email: rferrell@nsf.gov

- Angelica T. Brewer, Program Specialist, telephone: (703) 292-4636, email: abrewer@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of FastLane or Research.gov, contact:

- FastLane and Research.gov Help Desk: 1-800-673-6188
- FastLane Help Desk e-mail: fastlane@nsf.gov.
- Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: rgov@nsf.gov

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:

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

IX. Other Information

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

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

About The National Science Foundation

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

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

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

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* Chapter II.E.6 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** (703) 292-5111
  (NSF Information Center)**:**

- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090

- **To Order Publications or Forms:**

    Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov

    or telephone: (703) 292-8134

- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

Privacy Act And Public Burden Statements

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding applicants 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,