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Quick NSF Overview
### Directorate for Biological Sciences (BIO)

#### Division of Environmental Biology (DEB)
- Ecosystem Sciences
- Evolutionary Processes
- Population and Community Ecology
- Systematics and Biodiversity Science

#### Division of Integrative Organismal Systems (IOS)
- Behavioral Systems
- Developmental Systems
- Neural Systems
- Physiological and Structural Systems
- Plant Genome Research Program

#### Division of Molecular and Cellular Biosciences (MCB)
- Cellular Dynamics and Function
- Genetic Mechanisms
- Molecular Biophysics
- Systems and Synthetic Biology

#### Division of Biological Infrastructure (DBI)
- Research Resources
- Human Resources
- Centers, Facilities, and Additional Research Infrastructure
NSF is a very small agency... ...with a big impact!

93% of our budget goes out the door as grants
(Research & Related Activities + Education & Human Resources + Equipment & Facilities)

Total R&D by Agency
FY 2020

DOD 42%
NIH 25%
NASA 9%
DOE 12%
Other 6%
USDA 2%

NSF
4%

NSF Budget Request
FY 2023

Research & Related Activities
80%
Education & Human Resources
13%
Equipment & Facilities
2%
Agency Operation
5%

Sources: AAAS and NSF Budget Office
NSF by the Numbers

- **$8.8B** FY 2022 Enacted
- **93%** funds research, education, and related activities
- **$1.5B** for STEM education
- **$181M** to seed public/private partnerships*
- **253+** NSF-funded Nobel Prize winners
- **43K+** proposals evaluated
- **11K+** awards funded/year
- **2K** funded institutions
- **318K** people funded

Data represents FY 2021 Actuals unless otherwise indicated. * Corresponds to NSF investments initiated in FY 2021 and spanning multiple years.
Types of Proposals and Solicitations

- Solicited vs. unsolicited proposals
  - Solicitation describes a specific funding program, including some that are general in topic (i.e., BIO core programs)
  - Other proposals are submitted in response to the general NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG)
- Dear Colleague Letters (DCLs)
  - Usually announce a focus an existing funding opportunity on a specific program emphasis
- Deadlines vs. Target Dates
  - Firm vs. flexible
  - No deadlines for some programs and some proposal types (small grants, workshops, supplements)
Merit Review Overview
Merit Review Process

1. No Deadline/Deadline/Target Date/
2. Ad hoc review and/or
3. Panel
4. Program Director makes recommendation

Note that this varies across NSF
Merit Review Criteria

• **Intellectual Merit (IM):**
  the potential to advance knowledge

• **Broader Impacts (BI):**
  the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes
5 Review Elements

1. Will the work advance knowledge, and benefit society?

2. Is the work creative or potentially transformative?

3. Is the work plan sensible, and how will they know if they’re successful?

4. Is the team qualified?

5. Do they have adequate staff support and facility resources?
### Broader Impacts: Benefitting Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching, training, and learning (undergrads + grad students)</th>
<th>Broaden participation of underrepresented groups</th>
<th>Build or enhance partnerships (internationally, or with other agencies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad dissemination to enhance scientific + technological understanding</td>
<td>Enhance infrastructure (labs, equipment, + work in developing countries)</td>
<td>Local impacts (policies @ state + local level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSF Overview

2415 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, VA 22314
On Yellow Metro Line, 15 min. on Metro from National Mall.
NSF’s 10 Big Ideas

- Future of Work at the Human-Technology Frontier
- Growing Convergence Research
- Harnessing the Data Revolution
- Mid-scale Research Infrastructure
- Navigating the New Arctic
- NSF 2026
- NSF INCLUDES
- Quantum Leap
- Understanding the Rules of Life
- Windows on the Universe

Since 2017, NSF has been building a foundation for the Big Ideas through pioneering research and pilot activities. In 2019, NSF will invest $30 million in each Big Idea and continue to identify and support emerging opportunities for U.S. leadership in Big Ideas that serve the Nation’s future.
Funding

Find Funding

You can also find NSF funding opportunities at Grants.gov. Get NSF funding information by email or by RSS.

Enter Your Search Term

HBCU

Advanced Funding Search | Search Tips

A-Z Index

Use the A-Z Index to find funding opportunities by title.

Research Areas

- Biological Sciences
- Computer and Information Science and Engineering
- Crosscutting and NSF-wide
- Geosciences
- Integrative Activities
- International Science and Engineering
Types of funding mechanisms

• Research (see GPG Chapter II); response to general solicitation
• CAREER; for young investigators
• RAPID (see GPG Chapter II.D.1); In response to a severe urgency including quick-response research on natural or anthropogenic disasters and similar unanticipated events.
• EAGER (see GPG Chapter II.D.2); EArly-concept Grants for Exploratory Research Proposals—usually risky/high return-need to consult PD before applying
• Ideas Lab (see GPG Chapter II.D.3); specific solicitation
• Conference (see GPG Chapter II.D.9);
• Equipment (see GPG Chapter II.D.6);
• International Travel (see GPG Chapter II.D.10);
• Facility/Center (see relevant funding opportunity); or
• Fellowship (see relevant funding opportunity).
Other types of funding mechanisms

**Dear colleague letters;** special opportunities - usually short time windows

e.g. **NSF 19-058** Dear Colleague Letter: UKRI/BBSRC- NSF/BIO Lead Agency Opportunity in Bioinformatics, Microbiome, Quantum Biology and Synthetic Biology/Synthetic Cell

**Specific solicitations;** focused topic with additional requirements

e.g. Quantum leap challenge institutes (NSF 19-559)
The Proposal cycle

The IDEA

Talk to a program director

Talk to a program director

Preliminary Results

Proposal Preparation

Merit Review
• Intellectual Merit
• Broader Impacts

A Decline

An AWARD!
Merit Review

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 institution to conduct the proposed activities?

5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home institution or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?
Panel and ad-hoc review

Each proposal is reviewed at least by three reviewers

All reviewers are NOT experts in your field

Every proposal is first described by two-three panelist and then it is discussed by the whole panel and ranked by the panel

After all proposals are discussed, the rankings are re-discussed to ensure that relative ranking of the proposal are justified

Panel rankings are NOT funding recommendations, they are advisory to PDs who will make funding decisions.
Project Summary (very important)

• First page that program directors and reviewers will read
• **What**: Clearly state the research objectives first
• **Why**: Is this research needed? (Intellectual Merit)
• **How**: Describe the major research tasks and how broader impacts will be met
• Broader Impacts MUST be explicitly addressed in the *Project Summary* and the *Project Description* or your proposal will be disqualified and returned without review

This document should NOT be a simple summary of the proposed research activities.
How to develop a good research plan?

• **Ask yourself and convince reviewers**
  - What do you intend to do that others want to know?
  - Why is the work important, innovative and exciting?
  - What has already been done and why is your way better?
  - How are you going to do the work to answer the question uniquely?

• **Prepare yourself and demonstrate knowledge**
  - Literature survey and discussions with others
  - Get preliminary data for research and education components
  - If you do not have access to the best facilities, who will you collaborate/partner with?
Strengths of highly competitive proposals

- Novel idea/research question
- Well balanced feasibility and boldness
- Research plan addresses the question(s)
- Well justified
- Well written
- The PI is qualified
- Meaningful collaborations are in place (if needed)
- Facilities are available (at the institution or through collaboration)
Most common scientific mistakes

- Work is too close to what has been done before - i.e., Incremental advance
- Project has too large a scope or is too narrowly focused to be exciting
- Proposed methods/resolution/research plan are not likely to yield results that will address the stated goals of the project
- The experiment/theoretical/analytical design is flawed or alternative interpretation/analysis of data is ignored
- Resources not available or PI does not have demonstrated expertise in it
Comments you don’t want to see in reviews

- This is a solid but not particularly original study that stomps on old ground (incremental)
- The results of this study will have limited impact in the field
- The PI has not been very productive either during or since his/her Ph.D.
- This proposal is naive/overly ambitious
- The PI has not demonstrated expertise in this methodology
- Experimental design will not address the question
- Potential pitfalls and alternate strategies are not described
- Alternate interpretation of data is ignored
Educational component - critical for success

• Leverage activities at your institution that have relevance to your research
• Demonstration of previous results with successful education activities is a plus
• Who will benefit from the proposed activities?
• How will you know if these activities are having impact? (Assessment plan)
Most common mistakes

Education component is generic and what is already expected of any PI in your field, e.g. one more student is not enough.

Unrealistic goals - “this work will reshape K-12 education in the state of X”

Reinventing the wheel, one more blog, another website

Lack of understanding what is effective in education - literature search helps
Intellectual Merit

- Advancing knowledge
- Well-conceived and organized
- Creative and original concepts

Broader Impacts

- Advance discovery & promote learning
- Increase participation of underrepresented groups
- Broad dissemination of results
- Benefits to society
Personnel and budgets

- Request for support of other senior personnel, consultants, or sub-awards is allowed, their roles must be described in the project description.
- Co-PIs are allowed (except some special programs such as CAREER) - subject to change!
- Programs may support buy-out of academic year time for teaching-intensive institutions (check with your Program Director).
- Some Programs may prefer to make awards with budget close to the anticipated minimum size (check with your Program Officer).
- Budget must commensurate with the scope of the proposed work (asking too little will not improve funding chances!)
• **Project Description or Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources** must document the nature of all project collaborations, such as:
  - Intellectual contributions to the project
  - Permission to access a site, use instrumentation or facility
  - Offer to furnish samples / materials for research
  - Logistical support / evaluation services
  - Mentoring of U.S. students at a foreign site, if applicable

• Letter should consist of a single-sentence statement of collaboration:
  - “If the proposal submitted by Dr. [name of the PI] entitled [proposal title] is selected for funding by the NSF, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description.”

• **Must NOT** recommend or endorse PI or project
Proposal appearance

• This is a proposal and not a manuscript - Know the difference
• All parts of the proposal have a role to play in communicating your ideas to the reviewers and PDs
• Do not compress the font or squeeze the margins (RWR) - use your 15 page Project Description wisely
• Embed the figures correctly and make it look good on the page
• Demonstrate that the care you took with this proposal will translate in the way you perform your research and manage your education program
• If you cannot write well - Take a class!
Decision

• Peer Review
  - **Content** of the review is more important than rating
  - Program Director analyzes: Fairness and substance of the reviews; any technical issues raised (can they be resolved swiftly and easily); reviewer’s enthusiasm for the project; any additional feedback from reviewers/panels or other program officers; sometimes also clarification from the PI if needed

• Portfolio Balance
  - Research and education topics and their integration; potential for transformative impact in both; priority or timeliness of the area of research and systems; demographics of the PI population and diversity of institution types; stage of the career development of the PI; geographic diversity; gender balance; international partnerships
Declination is a fact of academic life

• Stay Calm and Do NOT Get Discouraged!
  • Breathe deeply and read the reviews more than once
  • Ask others to interpret the reviews for you
  • Contact the PO only after you have had time to digest the feedback (Reviews, Panel Summary, PO Comment, Context Statement) and reflect on your next move

• Resubmit only after addressing significant weaknesses
  • Do you need more preliminary data?
  • What were the common themes in the reviews?
  • Is one component better than another?
  • Did anyone identify a significant strength that you could build upon for resubmission?

DO NOT !!!

• Avoid your Program Director
• Be timid
• Give up!
Faculty early career development (CAREER) program

Next Deadlines:
• App. last week of July, 2024 (check the updates)
• Future Years: Fourth Monday in July
  - check for updates and changes

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES
• Eligibility requirements have been revised to clarify the required early-career status of applicants.
• Support for senior personnel other than the PI that is commensurate with a limited collaborative role in the project is now allowed in the budget of the proposal or of a sub recipient.
• The (CAREER) program is one of many NSF funding opportunities for new investigators.

• All NSF programs support new investigators as part of regular (“core”) research competitions.

• Approximately 20% of the research proposals from new investigators are submitted to the CAREER Program.

• It provides stable support at a sufficient level and duration to enable awardees to develop careers not only as outstanding researchers but also as effective, committed educators.

• Encourage faculty and academic institutions to value and support the integration of research and education in which the process of discovery stimulates learning and assures that research findings are quickly and effectively communicated in a broader context and to a large audience.
PI eligibility

• Hold a doctoral degree by proposal deadline
• Be untenured and employed in at least 50% tenure-track (or tenure-track-equivalent) assistant professor position at an eligible institution as of October 1st following deadline
• Have both research and educational responsibilities at the eligible institution
• Have not previously received a CAREER award
• Have not had more than two CAREER proposals reviewed previously
Tenure track equivalency

Must meet all of the following requirements: (1) the employee has a continuing appointment that is expected to last the five years of a CAREER grant; (2) the appointment has substantial research and educational responsibilities; and (3) the proposed project relates to the employee’s career goals and job responsibilities as well as to the mission of the department or organization.

The Departmental Letter must affirm that the investigator's appointment is at an early-career level equivalent to pre-tenure status, and must clearly and convincingly demonstrate how the faculty member's appointment satisfies all the above requirements of tenure-track equivalency.

Faculty members who are Associate Professors or in equivalent appointments, with or without tenure, are not eligible for the CAREER program. Faculty members who hold Adjunct Faculty or equivalent appointments are not eligible for the CAREER program.
Departmental letter

- Commitment to the PI’s proposed CAREER research and education activities

- Description of how the PI’s career goals and responsibilities mesh with that of the organization and department

- Description of how the department will contribute to the professional development of the PI with mentoring and whatever is needed to further the PI’s efforts to integrate research and education

- Statement indicating the PI’s eligibility for the CAREER program
CAREER Educational/outreach

• Think creatively about the reciprocal relationship between research and education activities and how they may inform each other in your career development

• Plans should reflect your own disciplinary and educational interests and goals, as well as the needs and context of your organization

• There are different expectations within different disciplinary fields - a wide range of research and education activities may be appropriate for the CAREER program

• Some investigators may wish to pursue an additional activity such as entrepreneurship, industry partnerships, or policy that enhances their research and education plans

• See the CAREER program solicitation for thought-provoking examples

• Communicate with the CAREER contact(s) in the Division(s) closest to your area of research to discuss expectations
Overview: Submitting your CAREER Proposal

• CAREER proposals are submitted to, and reviewed by, one or more of the disciplinary research programs
• Typical award sizes vary according to Directorate/Division/Program (BIO $500k and up)
• Talk to Division contact(s) for more information (https://www.nsf.gov/crssprgm/career/contacts.jsp)
• For interdisciplinary proposals, contact all relevant Program Directors or Division contacts
CAREER or Regular Proposal?

- CAREER proposals are single-PI projects that include research and education activities that are integrated, innovative, and ambitious.
- CAREER proposals require a letter of support from the Department Chair.
- The CAREER program’s aims are lofty - CAREER awards are a lot of work.
- Have you demonstrated commitment to both research and education?
NSF Blogs

Many Divisions and Directorates have Blogs.
Useful way to find out what’s new.
QUESTIONS?
Postdoctoral Research Fellowships in Biology
21-604

• Eligibility
  • U.S. citizen or permanent resident
  • You must not have served in postdoctoral capacity for more than 15 months prior to the application deadline

• Current areas
  1. Broadening Participation of Groups Under-represented in Biology
  2. Interactions of Genomes, and Environment and Phenotype
  3. Plant Genome Research Program

• Support provided for 2-3 years: $69,000 plus $15,000 allowance

• Deadline: See Solicitation (typically Nov or Dec)