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Sponsored Research Roles and Responsibilities

For each of the roles below, place a check in the appropriate column for whose role or responsibility it is to perform the described task. If the task is the responsibility of someone other than a PI, Department, College, ORA, or OCGA, write the name in the Other box. A list of possible “others” is provided below the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles and Responsibilities</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>ORA</th>
<th>OCGA</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Funding Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance on funding opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write technical narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify subcontractors and request budget and workscope materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify need for cost sharing funds and obtain documentation for cost share support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate requests for F&amp;A waivers or reductions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate space arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance on proposal preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and ensure accuracy of the Proposal Routing Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Review and Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm that proposal meets sponsor requirements (text, margins, font, page limits, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review proposal before sending proposal to ORA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify that cost sharing in proposal is listed and that all commitments have been secured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review proposed cost sharing for appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmatic review of proposal and sign Proposal Routing Form or electronically process Coeus Routing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide institutional review and approval of proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Submission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other may include the following:
- Procurement & Strategic Sourcing (PSS)
- Vice President for Research (VPR)
- Research Development Office (RDO)
- Office of General Counsel (GC)
- Human Resources (HR)
- Research Compliance Office (RCO)
- Office of Technology Commercialization (OTC)
- Export Compliance Office (ECO)
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**General Information**

**Program Title:**

IUSE/Professional Formation of Engineers: REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments (RED)

**Synopsis of Program:**

In FY 2016, the Directorates for Engineering (ENG), Computer and Information Science and Engineering (CISE) and Education and Human Resources (EHR) are continuing a program aligned with the Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) framework: REvolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments (herein referred to as RED). This funding opportunity enables engineering and computer science departments to lead the nation by successfully achieving significant sustainable changes necessary to overcome longstanding issues in their undergraduate programs and educate inclusive communities of engineering and computer science students prepared to solve 21st-century challenges.
In 2014, ENG launched an initiative, the Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE), to create and support an innovative and inclusive engineering profession for the 21st century. At the same time, in 2014, NSF launched the agency-wide Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) framework, which is a comprehensive effort to accelerate improvements in the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate education in all STEM fields. The RED program was first offered in FY 2015 as a PFE initiative aligned with the IUSE framework. Additional programs have been created within the IUSE framework across NSF, such as the IUSE: EHR program within EHR.

Even as demographic and regional socio-economic factors affect engineering and computer science departments in unique ways, there are certain tenets of sustainable change that are common across institutions. For instance, the development and engagement of the entire faculty within a department are paramount to the process, and they must be incentivized. Departmental cultural barriers to inclusion of students and faculty from different backgrounds must be identified and addressed. Finally, coherent technical and professional threads must be developed and woven across the four years, especially (1) in the core technical courses of the middle two years, (2) in internship opportunities in the private and public sectors, and (3) in research opportunities with faculty. These and other threads aim to ensure that students develop deep knowledge in their discipline more effectively and meaningfully, while at the same time building their capacities for 21st century and “T-shaped” professional skills, including design, leadership, communication, understanding historical and contemporary social contexts, lifelong learning, professional ethical responsibility, creativity, entrepreneurship, and multidisciplinary teamwork. It is expected that, over time, the awardees of this program will create knowledge concerning sustainable change in engineering and computer science education that can be scaled and adopted nationally across a wide variety of academic institutions. The research on departmental change that results from these projects should inform change more broadly across the STEM disciplines.

Note: The RED program is offered in alignment with the NSF-wide undergraduate STEM education initiative, Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE). More information about IUSE can be found in the Introduction of this solicitation. Prospective PIs are encouraged to consider the IUSE: EHR program for projects that are outside the scope of RED (see https://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=505082). Specifically, the Institutional and Community Transformation (ICT) track promotes innovative approaches to using research to catalyze change that addresses challenges across and within institutions (institutional transformation), as well as within and across specific disciplines (community transformation). Prospective PIs are strongly discouraged from submitting identical or substantially similar proposals to RED and IUSE: EHR.
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Estimated Number of Awards: 6 to 8

Six to eight awards will be made, each in an amount from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 total for a duration of up to 5 years. Proposals that fall outside of these limits will be returned without review. Estimated program budget, number of awards, and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds and the quality of proposals received.

Anticipated Funding Amount: $11,950,000

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

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

◆ Universities and Colleges - Universities and two- and four-year colleges (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in, the US acting on behalf of their faculty members. Such
organizations also are referred to as academic institutions.

Who May Serve as PI:

The Principal Investigator(s) must be a department chair/head (or equivalent) to establish institutional accountability. Additionally, there must be a RED team that includes (at a minimum) an expert in engineering education or computer science education research, who can ground the research plan in the literature, and a social science expert who can evaluate department dynamics and monitor change processes. The social scientist must have expertise to advise on strategies for developing a culture of change and on strategies for creating meaningful collective ownership of the effort among faculty, students, and staff.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization: 2

An organization is allowed up to two submissions per competition.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI: 1

A Principal Investigator is allowed only one submission per competition.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Submission of Letters of Intent is required. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required
- **Full Proposals:**

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
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**Merit Review Criteria:** National Science Board approved criteria. Additional merit review considerations apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.

Award Administration Information

**Award Conditions:** Standard NSF award conditions apply.

**Reporting Requirements:** Additional reporting requirements apply. Please see the full text of this solicitation for further information.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Over the past several decades various studies, reports, and initiatives on science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, or STEM, education and diversity were led by the National Science Board, the National Academies, the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST), the President’s Council on Jobs and Competitiveness, think tanks, and others. Yet, over time, the messages are similar, and in some cases identical. They have brought to the forefront the acute awareness of national grand challenges and of the structural disconnect between STEM workforce needs and student engagement and preparation to meet those needs. However, many of these studies explore STEM more broadly and not the unique aspects of “S,” “T,” “E,” and “M.”

The “E” in STEM, Engineering, has many unique aspects. Engineers’ abilities in design and systems thinking enable them to utilize their integrative, creative capacity to leverage technology in improving quality of life for people and the planet. Because of engineers’ immediate ability to contribute professionally upon graduation, the BS degree in engineering (including software engineering) is distinctive as a professional degree with eligibility to qualify for the Professional Engineer (PE) license [1].

With respect to computer science, the growing support for “CS+X” curricular approaches acknowledges the intersection of computer science and other disciplines, including the humanities. CS+X majors acknowledge the increasingly ubiquitous nature of computing, with applications in virtually any field imaginable, and allow students to tackle the increasingly complicated sociotechnical challenges that will confront them professionally.

Furthermore, in the high-tech environment upon which the global economy is based, the perennial debate about workforce shortages of engineers and computer scientists requires a more precise understanding of dynamic industry needs and of the abilities of departments to address them. Finally, the inclusion of persons from groups underrepresented in most disciplines of engineering and computer science has remained a stubborn, longstanding issue, especially in electrical engineering, mechanical engineering, computer engineering, and computer science, among others.

Therefore, NSF is taking a holistic look at how engineers and computer scientists are being prepared for a lifelong career in the profession. It seeks to respond to the perennial calls from different stakeholders (e.g., industry, the public, government, and the profession itself) to form engineers and computer scientists with a broad set of professional abilities. It seeks to address the fact that the percentages of persons from underrepresented groups entering into – and remaining in – the practice of engineering and computer science are still unacceptably low, impacting the future health of the profession. Furthermore, engineering is a career with entry to licensure following completion of the baccalaureate degree; hence, there is a need to seek alignment and quality of experiences for engineers to achieve this status.

To address these and related matters, in 2014, ENG launched an initiative, the Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE), to create and support an innovative and inclusive engineering profession for the 21st century. The engineering profession must be responsive to national priorities, grand challenges, and dynamic workforce needs, and it must be equally open and available to all. The RED program was first offered in FY 2015 as a PFE initiative aligned with the IUSE framework. The RED program is jointly supported by ENG, CISE and EHR directorates, as all three directorates support formation of engineers and computer scientists and institutional transformation as part of their overall strategies.

The importance of the undergraduate experience for preparing both a diverse STEM workforce equipped for innovation and a STEM-literate public ready to support and benefit from the progress of science is described in a number of key reports and documents [e.g., Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Revisited (National Research Council, 2010); Expanding Underrepresented Minority Participation (National Research Council, 2011); Engage to Excel (President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, 2012); Discipline-based Education Research (National Research Council, 2012); Federal Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education 5-Year Strategic Plan (National Science and Technology Council, Committee on STEM Education, 2013)].

Improving Undergraduate STEM Education (IUSE) is NSF’s comprehensive, Foundation-wide framework for an integrated vision of the agency’s investments in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education. The key guiding principle of IUSE is to ensure focused, strategic investments that address the greatest challenges in U.S. undergraduate STEM education. The long-term goals of the IUSE framework are to: 1) improve STEM learning and learning environments, 2) broaden participation and institutional capacity for STEM learning, and 3) build the professional STEM workforce for tomorrow. Collectively, IUSE programs will 1) build core knowledge, 2) implement and scale evidence-based practices, 3) catalyze departmental and institutional transformation, 4) provide scholarships, and 5) promote disciplinary research experiences. NSF expects that investments within the IUSE portfolio will be informed by theories and findings from education research with attention to the needs and directions of frontier science and engineering research. New knowledge about both learning and implementation will be developed across all IUSE investments through a vibrant partnership of scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and education experts.

In FY2016, IUSE will

- Expand the emphasis on bringing evidence-based practices to scale for both the general improvement of STEM learning, and also to expand effective discipline-specific innovations;
- Focus on strategies for engaging undergraduates in their first two years in authentic research experiences both in courses and in other settings; and
- Emphasize broadening participation and workforce development in computer science, engineering, and geosciences.
II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. Professional Formation

The complex problems facing society in the 21st century demand changes to the way engineers and computer scientists are educated. For example, solving the NAE Grand Challenges will require computer scientists and engineers who not only have deep technical knowledge, but also an understanding of the societal and global contexts in which those problems occur. Among the common challenges facing engineering and computer science departments are how to weave both technical and professional skills throughout the curriculum, including skills defined by the ABET outcomes; how to promote and incentivize faculty engagement in the change process; and how to create cultures of inclusion that are welcoming to students and faculty of all types. Revolutionary change is needed in the structure of departments and the way students are educated to meet these challenges.

Professional Formation of Engineers (PFE) refers to the formal and informal processes and value systems through which people become engineers. It also includes the ethical responsibility of practicing engineers to sustain and grow the profession in order to improve quality of life for all peoples. Professional formation includes, but is not limited, to:

- Introductions to the profession at any age;
- Acquisition of deep technical and professional skills, knowledge, and abilities in both formal and informal settings/domains;
- Development of outlooks, perspectives, ways of thinking, knowing, and doing;
- Development of identity as an engineer (e.g., systems designer and integrator); and
- Acculturation to the profession, its standards, and norms.

Professional formation occurs within a complex ecosystem that includes formal classrooms; informal settings such as Maker spaces (hands-on, do-it-yourself environments where community members gather to create, invent, and learn [5]); industry settings (including co-op and internship experiences); as well as early career (engineer-in-training (EIT)/engineering intern (EI)) work, research experiences, mentor/mentee, and sponsor/sponsor relationships, etc. To facilitate such activities, engineers must understand and navigate this ecosystem for successful professional formation and practice. They must oversee and participate in developing and maintaining this ecosystem, with smooth and clear pathways to and through the profession. Pathways may include formal and informal education, apprenticeship (in some states), credentialing, and licensure.

NSF is committed to enabling a vibrant engineering profession for the 21st Century. To that end, the current PFE ecosystem must be studied and understood. Gaps and barriers to PFE must be identified, and weak “target points” in the pathways through the profession must be strengthened or eliminated. A “target point” is a vulnerable transition, or perhaps even an undesirable climate, that impacts the preparation steps toward becoming an engineer. Example “target points” include the typical transitions from high school into a two-year or four-year engineering or computer science degree program; from two-year to four-year institutions; from a BS degree to industry or graduate school; or from a BS to graduate degree to professional licensure [5]. A “target point” also may reflect a formal or informal setting comprised of individuals of different backgrounds with little or no guidance on how to interact, or it may reflect narrow conceptions of what engineering is or should be that create strict and non-porous boundaries for the profession.

The Engineering Directorate has identified one of the most critical “target points” to successful professional formation: it is the engineering “core” – i.e., the middle two years of the four year undergraduate experience, during which students receive the bulk of their formal technical preparation [4]. These middle years are also a critical transition point for transfer students from community colleges and a primary attribution point for engineering majors. During the middle two years, students often find themselves without context to grasp the big picture surrounding technically focused courses that are widely perceived as “real” engineering. Moreover, many professional skills - those that define what an engineer is and does in the workforce – are emphasized in the first year but de-emphasized or dropped entirely in the middle two years, only to be picked up again in upper level electives or capstone design experiences, where they often must be re-taught. These gaps in the middle years are often quite large, and the potential richness of intern/co-op experiences in industry or of research experiences with faculty during this timeframe, if indeed the student has such opportunities in the first place. These gaps often contribute to confusion and frustration among students during the middle years, and they impact disproportionately those typically underrepresented in engineering.

Computer science students often are confronted with similar challenges through the middle years of their programs. For instance, some computer science students opt out of the degree track midway through because they find their computer science curricula to not be the bedrock of their academic interests, but rather to be the foundations for the technical skills with which they will pursue their personal and professional passions. At the same time, computer science enrollments are burgeoning across the Nation, as a result of growing interest in the field and the increasingly important role that advances in computing are playing in all areas of science, engineering, education, and society. For example, there is growing support for “CS+X” approaches that acknowledge the intersection of computer science and other disciplines, including the humanities. In an era of social-entrepreneurship and constantly evolving complex socio-technical challenges, computer science education is moving to better equip students to be successful in this new world. The inescapable technical rigor of the middle years courses does not have to be isolated from the social context and broader inter- and multi-disciplinary opportunities that are drawing so many students to the field.

Hence, there is a need to build research capacity to better understand the complexity of the engineering and computer science education ecosystems and how to optimize them. There is a need to understand required change processes in these ecosystems, and once understood, to clearly articulate and implement these change processes. Finally, there is a need to increase welcome and access for groups underrepresented in engineering and computer science practice.

B. Revolutionizing Engineering and Computer Science Departments

Prior engineering education research has led to successes in the introductory and capstone years. However, little research has been done to bridge the innovations in introductory- and capstone-level engineering and computer science education across the entire undergraduate experience, including extracurricular professional activities and student transitions in and out of the program. Furthermore, prior research also has revealed the need for faculty development, faculty reward systems, and academic cultures that encourage engagement of faculty and students of diverse backgrounds in the full undergraduate-level formation process.

Thus, the goal of REVolutionizing engineering and computer science Departments (RED) is to address the stated challenges and develop well-functioning departments that may overcome them with a focus on student success in their professional formation attainment. Specific activities supported by the RED solicitation may include, but are not limited to:

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

- Exploring strategies for institutional, systemic, and cultural change, including new approaches to faculty governance or department structures and to restructuring faculty incentive or reward systems;

- Exploring collaborative arrangements with industry and other stakeholders who are mutually interested in developing the best possible professional formation environment and opportunities for students;

- Exploring strategies to bridge the engineering and computer science education research-to-practice gap, primarily through faculty development and adoption of best practices in the professional formation of engineers and computer scientists;

- Devising mechanisms to make change sustainable in the department beyond the award period; and

- Devising mechanisms to make change adaptable to other departments and institutions.

All these, and other, activities must focus on how they impact students of different backgrounds navigating the varied pathways through the undergraduate professional formation process.

C. Key Features of RED

For the RED solicitation, proposed efforts for departmental change should be revolutionary, not incrementally reformist, and strategies should be developed with impact on the student as the focus. Revolutionary means radically, suddenly, or completely new; producing fundamental, structural change; or going outside of or beyond existing norms and principles. Proposed efforts must be grounded in sound educational theory and work to enable a continuous progression of professional formation through the four year experience. Efforts should address 21st-century and T-shaped skills (i.e., cross-disciplinary breadth), and they should be aligned with stakeholder expectations.

The intent of this solicitation is to focus on significant, systemic departmental change as it impacts student success in their professional formation. Proposals should reflect:

- A clear demonstration of the PI, i.e., the chair/head (or equivalent), as an innovative leader of systemic change in the department to achieve the stated goals of the RED activities.

- An understanding of the role of each of the RED team members in creating change, demonstrating clear and significant contributions from the department head or dean, the engineering or computer science education expert, and the social scientist attuned to departmental dynamics.

- An understanding of the research on how students of diverse backgrounds learn engineering or computer science and what has been previously attempted.

- An understanding of how engineering or computer science education research connects to practice and of barriers to faculty adoption of engineering or computer science education innovations.

- An appreciation that faculty participation, engagement, development, and belief in the scholarship of learning are critical to success.

- An understanding of the importance of linking to professional practice through involvement of the department’s or college’s existing Industrial Advisory Board (or equivalent);

- An acknowledgement of additional example strategies, such as increasing the stature of professor(s) of practice and their role as change agents or connecting the work with professional masters programs.

- A research component that has the potential to inform the academic community more broadly regarding important factors that lead to institutional change.

- An incorporation of scalability and adaptability considerations. Often, successful innovations in engineering and computer science education do not spread much beyond their origin. This can be seen in large variations in retention, diversity, and preparation across departments and institutions. Scalability and adaptability are two fundamental characteristics that are necessary for local innovations to have large scale impacts. It is therefore critical that proposed approaches incorporate scalability and adaptability by design. In addition, it would be important to adapt best practices and strategies from scaling of social innovations, leverage potential power of social and professional networking tools, and synergistic connections with stakeholder networks such as ASEE, NSBE, SWE, SHPE, ASME, IEEE, NCTM, NCWIT, IAAMCS, ACM, CRA, and other organizations. Successful proposals would include creative strategies that maximize probability of scaling and adaptation for large scale national impacts.


III. AWARD INFORMATION

Six to eight awards will be made, each in an amount from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 total for a duration of up to 5 years. Estimated program budget, number of awards, and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds and the quality of proposals received.

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Submit Proposals:

- Universities and Colleges - Universities and two- and four-year colleges (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in, the US acting on behalf of their faculty members. Such
organizations also are referred to as academic institutions.

Who May Serve as PI:

The Principal Investigator(s) must be a department chair/head (or equivalent) to establish institutional accountability. Additionally, there must be a RED team that includes (at a minimum) an expert in engineering education or computer science education research, who can ground the research plan in the literature, and a social science expert who can evaluate department dynamics and monitor change processes. The social scientist must have expertise to advise on strategies for developing a culture of change and on strategies for creating meaningful collective ownership of the effort among faculty, students, and staff.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization: 2

An organization is allowed up to two submissions per competition.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or Co-PI: 1

A Principal Investigator is allowed only one submission per competition.

Additional Eligibility Info:

Only colleges and universities with baccalaureate engineering and/or computer science programs located and accredited in the U.S. are eligible to apply. However, partnerships are encouraged with local two year colleges (including community colleges), to ensure that the impacts of departmental changes on two-year colleges (and especially the two-to-four year pathway through engineering and/or computer science) are properly considered.

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Letters of Intent (required):

A one-page Letter of Intent is required to be submitted by the lead institution for each proposal. Letters of Intent are not reviewed. They are used to gauge the submission of proposals and the review requirements. No feedback will be given.

The format of the letter is as follows:

Institution:

Engineering or Computer Science Department:

PI (Dept. Head/Chair or equivalent), with contact information:

RED team members and their roles:

Partners/Collaborators:

Project Title: The title should begin with “IUSE/PFE:RED:”

Synopsis (200-word limit): Provide a brief summary of the vision for the department, goals of the proposed RED project, and preliminary plans for sustainability after NSF funding.

Letter of Intent Preparation Instructions:

When submitting a Letter of Intent through FastLane in response to this Program Solicitation please note the conditions outlined below:

- Sponsored Projects Office (SPO) Submission is not required when submitting Letters of Intent
- A Minimum of 0 and Maximum of 4 Other Senior Project Personnel are allowed
- Submission of multiple Letters of Intent is not allowed

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

- Full proposals submitted via FastLane: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the NSF Grant Proposal Guide (GPG). The complete text of the GPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: http://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=gpg.
  Paper copies of the GPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. Proposers are reminded to identify this program solicitation number in the program solicitation block on the NSF Cover Sheet For Proposal to the National Science Foundation. Compliance with this requirement is critical to determining the relevant proposal processing guidelines. Failure to submit this information may delay processing.

- 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: (http://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) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

In determining which method to utilize in the electronic preparation and submission of the proposal, please note the following:
Collaborative Proposals. All collaborative proposals submitted as separate submissions from multiple organizations must be submitted via the NSF FastLane system. Chapter II, Section D.5 of the Grant Proposal Guide provides additional information on collaborative proposals.

See Chapter II.C.2 of the GPG 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 GPG instructions.

Full Proposal Contents

This program solicitation contains supplemental instructions to the Grant Proposal Guide (GPG) and NSF Grants.gov Application Guide. All standard sections of the proposal are required (i.e., the cover sheet, project summary, table of contents, project description, references cited, biographical sketch, budget, budget justification, current and pending support, facilities/equipment/other resources, and supplementary documentation). The following instructions supplement the guidelines in the GPG and NSF Grants.gov Application Guide for the specified sections.

The proposal should include the following information in the project description:

Vision for Revolutionizing the Engineering or Computer Science Department – Describe the department and the student professional formation experience “after the revolution”. How is success defined? Provide a concise answer to the question, “What will be different?”

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

- Goals: What outcomes at the end of this project will move the department toward the vision? What will change about the department? What will change about the faculty? What will change about the professional formation of students? What will change nationally? Who will be impacted?
- Objectives: What specific targets will impact achieving the stated goals? For example, if a goal is a faculty well-equipped and enthusiastic about professional formation, what incentives are intended to be provided?
- Specific Actions: How will objectives be accomplished? For example, what will the process be for changing the faculty development incentive system? What is the theory of change; that is, substantiate how and why should these activities effect lasting change? How will the impacts of the activities be measured? How will the effects be sustained in the long term, especially if there are changes in department leadership over time? Explain who will be responsible for which elements of the project. Be sure to cover what has been attempted previously in the literature, such that the proposed innovations of the RED activities are not repeated.
- Research Plan: What will this project add to the knowledge base about creating change at the department level in engineering or computer science? What are the research questions you seek to answer? What educational or sociological theories speak to your research questions and the methodologies one might use to shape appropriate methods to answer the research questions posed? How will the achievement of the objectives and goals be measured? These measures can be qualitative or quantitative as appropriate to the question and theoretical orientation.
- Barriers: What are the anticipated barriers in carrying out the project plans and achieving the specific objectives? What are the anticipated barriers to connecting research to practice? What contingency plans are in place to address these barriers?
- External Advisory Board (Required): How will an external advisory board (for the department or college) be used to advance the proposed plan? Who will be included and why, and how will they contribute to the project?
- Evaluation Plan: Based on the theory of change and the desirable outcomes of the proposed revolution, enumerate appropriate indicators of success related to accomplishing the goals and objectives and a timeframe to seek measurable change.

- Mentoring Plans: Explain how faculty will be mentored over the course of this project; what faculty development opportunities will be provided; and how they will be incentivized. Explain how graduate and undergraduate students will be involved in the project and how they will be mentored as part of the proposed departmental vision for revolution.
- Roadmap for Scaling and Adaptation: How will the new knowledge generated about departmental change be received and adapted by others? (This effort must go beyond traditional “dissemination” and include considerations of scalability and adaptability to achieve larger scale impacts.) How will partnerships be built and used to extend the work of this project to others?

Supplementary Documentation:

Institutional Information – Provide full descriptive demographics for your institution and department(s) in a supplemental document not to exceed two pages.

- Describe the undergraduate, graduate, and faculty populations. This should include information about race/ethnicity, gender, disabilities, and academic level or rank, if possible.
- Provide current retention data for undergraduates (separately for both first-time-full-time first-year and transfer students) and how these data were calculated. Of particular interest are the 2nd to 3rd year retention rate and the 5-year graduation rate. This information should include racial/ethnic, gender, and persons with disabilities breakdowns, if possible.
- Provide an overview of department instructional activities including who teaches the courses, labs, and recitation sections, the faculty teaching load, and class sizes.
- Describe department processes, policies, and roles related to faculty development, professional formation of students, and department governance.
- Describe the department’s prior efforts in enhancing teaching and learning practices or in department level reform of engineering or computer science education, including strengths and weaknesses and areas targeted for improvement.

Scan the signed original(s) of the following document(s) and upload the scans as a PDF file into the Supplementary Documents section of the proposal. Do not send paper copies to NSF. All documents must be submitted with the proposal in FastLane or Grants.gov by the deadline.

Letter(s) from Institutional Leadership – Provide letters of commitment from the Dean, Provost, and/or President (as appropriate for your project) to ensure support and feasibility in the short and long term. The Letter(s) should be no more than 2 pages in length, and it must include the individual’s name and title below the signature.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing: Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Other Budgetary Limitations:
NSF's mission calls for the broadening of opportunities and expanding participation of groups, institutions, and geographic regions that investing in building the knowledge that informs improvements in STEM teaching and learning. NSF also supports development of a strong science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce by national innovation ecosystem is to provide cutting-edge research under the guidance of the Nation's most creative scientists and STEM workforce to advance the frontiers of science and participate in the U.S. technology-based economy. NSF's contribution to the projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions must recruit, train, and prepare a diverse workforce.

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.

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 the GPG as Exhibit III-1.

A comprehensive description of the Foundation's merit review process is available on the NSF website at:

Proposers should also be aware of core strategies that are essential to the fulfillment of NSF's mission, as articulated in Investing in Science, Engineering, and Education for the Nation's Future: NSF Strategic Plan for 2014-2018. 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.
- A meaningful and adequate review 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. (GPG 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 GPG 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 underrepresented minorities 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 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.

#### Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

- **Vision:** How revolutionary is the vision in light of a well-grounded understanding of the history, context, and culture of the department? Revolutionary means radically, suddenly, or completely new; producing fundamental, structural change; or going outside of or beyond existing norms and principles.
VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to the submitting organization by a Grants Officer in the Division of Grants and Agreements. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be informed 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/Project Director by the Program Officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

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 http://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-7827 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.


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 be completed and submitted by each reviewer. 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 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.
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 at least 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. (Some programs or awards require submission of more frequent project reports). Within 90 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.


Additional Reporting

As part of the annual report, PIs should include updated institutional profile data as requested in this solicitation. PIs should also include discussion of department dynamics and obstacles or progress in establishing a culture supportive of holistic professional formation of engineers and/or computer scientists.

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:

- Elliot Douglas, Solicitation Coordinator, Program Director, Engineering Education, telephone: (703) 292-7051, email: edouglas@nsf.gov
- Kamau Bobb, Program Director, STEM + Computing Partnerships, Division of Computer and Network Systems, Computer & Information Science & Engineering Directorate, telephone: (703) 292-4291, email: kbobb@nsf.gov
- Glenn H. Larsen, Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR), Division of Industrial Innovation and Partnerships (IIP), Engineering Directorate, telephone: (703) 292-4607, email: glarsen@nsf.gov
- William Olbricht, Program Director, Designing Materials to Revolutionize and Engineer our Future, Division of Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental, and Transport Systems, Engineering Directorate, telephone: (703) 292-2563, email: wolbrich@nsf.gov
- Zhijian Pei, Program Director, Manufacturing, Machines and Equipment, Division of Civil, Mechanical, and Manufacturing Innovation (CMMI), Engineering Directorate, telephone: (703) 292-8611, email: zpei@nsf.gov
- Yvette Weatherton, Program Director, Division of Undergraduate Education (DUE), Education and Human Resources Directorate, telephone: (703) 292-5323, email: yweather@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of FastLane, contact:

- FastLane Help Desk, telephone: 1-800-673-6188; e-mail: fastlane@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 at https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/USNSF/subscriber/new?topic_id=USNSF_179.

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 http://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 provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See Grant Proposal Guide Chapter II, Section D.2 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.

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 Systems of Records, NSF-50, "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004), and NSF-51, "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records," 69 Federal Register 26410 (May 12, 2004). 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
Office of the General Counsel
National Science Foundation
Arlington, VA 22230

Location:
4201 Wilson Blvd. Arlington, VA 22230

For General Information
(703) 292-5111

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

To Order Publications or Forms:
Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov
or telephone:
(703) 292-7827

To Locate NSF Employees:
(703) 292-5111
Please **complete this form in its entirety**, including signatures by Principal Investigator (PIs), Co-Principal Investigator(s), Department Chairperson/Director of administering unit, and Dean; send it and one copy of the proposal to ORA. Allow six (6) working days prior to the deadline for processing within ORA, **incomplete forms will delay review**. Call 301-405-6269 for assistance.

1. **Proposal Title**: ________________

2. a. **Start Date**: ________________ (mm/dd/yyyy)  b. **End Date**: ________________ (mm/dd/yyyy)

3. **Proposal/Application Type**:  
   - [ ] New  
   - [ ] Renewal  
   - [ ] Continuation  
   - [ ] Revision  
   - [ ] Resubmission  
   If not New: Related Proposal Number: ________________, Related KFS Number: ________________

4. **Activity Type**:  
   - [ ] Research  
   - [ ] Training/Instruction  
   - [ ] Fellowship  
   - [ ] IGPA  
   - [ ] Service/Other Sponsored Activity  
   - [ ] Basic  
   - [ ] Development  
   - [ ] Clinical Trial

5. **Sponsor**:  
   a. **Contact Name and Address**: 
      - Name: ____________________________  
      - Address: ____________________________  
      - Phone: ____________________________  
      - Email: ____________________________  
      - URL: ____________________________  
   b. **Prime Sponsor**: Are flow-through funds used?  
      - [ ] yes  
      - [ ] no  
      If **yes**, prime sponsor’s name: ____________________________
   c. **Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (CFDA)**: ________________

6. **Deadline Date for Proposal**: 
   - [ ] Postmarked  
   - [ ] Receipt/Delivered  
   - [ ] No unique guidelines apply  
   - [ ] URL for Announcement, etc: ____________________________

7. **Submission Instructions**:  
   - [ ] Electronic Submission, system: ____________________________  
   - Department to pick-up proposal: Name: ____________________________, Ext. ________________
8a. **Departmental contact for budget questions**: Name: ____________________________, Email: ____________________________, Ext. ________________

8b. **PI contact for other questions**: Name: ____________________________, Email: ____________________________, Ext. ________________

9. **Principal Investigator/Co-Principal Investigator(s)**  
   **NOTE**: All accounts created for any award resulting from this proposal will follow the credit split listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PI Name</th>
<th>% Credit for Project:</th>
<th>% Credit for Investigator:</th>
<th>% Credit for Investigator:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-PI Name</th>
<th>% Credit for Project:</th>
<th>% Credit for Investigator:</th>
<th>% Credit for Investigator:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional Co-Investigators or other Project Personnel, attach the Supplemental Staff form, available at [ora.umd.edu/sites/default/files/documents/forms/supplemental-staff-form.pdf](http://ora.umd.edu/sites/default/files/documents/forms/supplemental-staff-form.pdf).
### Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested Start Date</th>
<th>Initial Period</th>
<th>Total Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested End Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Indirect Cost (F&amp;A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Period</th>
<th>Total Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 11. Facilities & Administrative Cost Rate(s):%

- Facilities & Administrative Cost Base:
  - [ ] MTDC
  - [ ] TDC
  - [ ] Other (use only when 0% F&A)

- Is this other than the on-campus rate?
  - [ ] yes
  - [ ] no
  - Why?

- If any portion of the project is off campus, where?

Note: An off-campus project is defined as one which, for 3 or more continuous months, does not make use of facilities or space supported by the University of Maryland. Off campus “adjacent” sites are within a 50 mile radius of College Park. Off campus “remote” sites are beyond that. Projects are designated as on campus unless 25% or more of the project direct costs meet the off campus definition. If a proposal has both on and off campus components, the budget needs to be apportioned appropriately.

#### 12. Cost-sharing

- [ ] yes
- [ ] no

**Total UM Contribution** $__________

**Total non-UM Contribution** $__________

**NOTE:** If cost-sharing is included, you must provide a document detailing the contributions and authorizing signature(s) as a supplement to this routing form. See cost sharing policy: [www.president.umd.edu/policies/2014-iv-400a.html](http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/2014-iv-400a.html).

#### 13. Subawards

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, subawardee’s name: __________________________

Subawardee’s proposal (statement of work, budget, budget justification) endorsed by its authorized official must accompany the proposal.

#### 14. Are there additional resources (such as space, operating or equipment funds, utility service) required to conduct this project over and above those already budgeted for or approved by your department?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, please list.

#### 15. Does this proposal budget include administrative support costs such as administrative/clerical salary and/or office supplies/communications costs?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, proposal budget must include explicit justification of these costs in accordance with UMCP Policy VIII-10.40(A).

#### 16. Does the proposal include a tuition or fee waiver on academic year, winter term, or summer programs?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, documentation of approval from the Office of the Provost, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, or Office of Summer & Winter Terms must be provided with the proposal.

#### 17. Does this project offer courses for credit?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

If yes, have they been approved by Academic Affairs?

List courses:

Refer to [umresearch.umd.edu/Export/overview.html](http://umresearch.umd.edu/Export/overview.html) for more information about Export Control.

#### 18. Are any export controls indicated in the solicitation or in discussions with the sponsor, or does the research relate directly to a military technology?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

#### 19. Will this project require the use of another party’s proprietary (restricted) information or materials?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

- If yes to 19a, will such information be subject to a nondisclosure agreement or any other agreement authorizing a sponsor or other party to withhold from publication information provided to UM?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

- Will the researchers need to generate any data that will be considered confidential or proprietary?

If yes to any of the above, attach copies of any proposed NDA and/or any other agreement containing any restriction on publication or research results.
Indicate whether your project contains the following:

20. **a. Human subjects:** Will this research include using Human Subjects? If yes, has an IRB application been submitted to the IRB office?
   - Yes
   - No
   If yes, has an IRB application been submitted to the IRB office? Please provide the title used on the IRB application and the IRB protocol approval number.
   - Yes
   - No
   An IRB application has not been submitted for this project, but will be if this project is awarded. Submit one copy of the proposal protocol form to the IRB office. For more information, contact the IRB office at irb@umd.edu.

21. **a. Animal subjects:** Will this research include using vertebrate animals? If yes, has an IACUC protocol approval number been assigned?
   - Yes
   - No
   An IACUC application has not yet been submitted for this project. For more information, contact the IACUC Coordinator at x55037 or iacuc-office@umd.edu.

22. **a. Radioactive materials:** Will radioactive materials (H-3, C-14, P-32, gamma irradiator, etc.) be used in this research?
   - Yes
   - No

22. **b. Ionizing radiation:** Will devices which produce ionizing radiation (x-ray units, electron microscopes, particle accelerators, etc.) be used in this research?
   - Yes
   - No

22. **c. Non-ionizing radiation:** Will a source of non-ionizing radiation be used in this research? Check any which apply.
   - Laser(s)
   - Radio Frequency devices
   - Infra-red devices (other than lasers)
   - Other Electromagnetic devices
   - Ultraviolet devices (other than lasers)
   - Microwave devices
   If yes to any of the above, the Radiation Safety Office must provide authorization of the PI, hazard assessment, and/or training. If the PI is not currently authorized, contact the Radiation Safety Office at x53960 for assistance.

23. **Yes**
24. **No**
25. **No**
26. **Yes**
27. **No**
28. **Yes**

29. **Abstract** (150 words or less) required.

Approved protocols are required in order for accounts to be set up for awards which include human subjects, animal subjects, radioactive materials, biological materials, select agent toxins, and scientific diving.
30. a. yes no **Conflict of Interest:** Is there a real or potential conflict of interest in connection with this work involving a University of Maryland employee, as defined by the University of Maryland Policies and Procedures II-3.10(A) or II-3.10(B) (www.umresearch.umd.edu/RCO/COI/index.html).

If yes, a disclosure form must be completed and submitted in accordance with these procedures.

30. b. yes no **FCOI Mandatory Disclosure:** Is this a proposal to a PHS sponsor, PHS prime sponsor, or a sponsor/prime sponsor which follows PHS’s Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) regulations?

Yes no If yes to 30b, have all individuals responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of the research completed the IRBNet Financial Conflict of Interest in accordance with the University of Maryland Policies and Procedures on Financial Conflicts of Interest in Public Health Service Funded Research II-3.10(C)?

For more information on FCOI, refer to: www.umresearch.umd.edu/RCO/FCOI/index.html

31. If proposal contains draft technical or other provisional materials and the PI will be responsible for submitting the proposal, PI is responsible for ensuring a copy of the final proposal as submitted to sponsor is provided simultaneously to ORA. All budget and cost sharing commitments must be finalized before the proposal is routed.

32. PI’s signature below affirms that no changes in scope, budget, or institutional commitments will be made in the final proposal without first contacting ORA.

33. PI’s & Co-PI’s signatures below affirm:

a) that the information submitted within the proposal is true, complete, and accurate to the best of the PI’s & Co-PI’s knowledge;

b) that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject him/her to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties;

c) that PIs and Co-PIs agree to accept responsibility for the conduct of the project and to follow any terms and conditions of any resulting agreement, including, but not limited to, providing required progress reports and adhering to any requirements relating to the handling of confidential information.

**Note:** Proposal cover page must have space for signature of the University’s authorized signature authority (Office of Research Administration) when sponsor’s form does not provide for this.

ORA reserves the right to withdraw from consideration any proposal that was received less than two full business days prior to its submission due date and which was received by ORA without sponsor solicitation guidelines.

34. Your signature below indicates approval of this proposal and concurrence with the statements on this form. Endorsements must include PI, Co-PI(s), administering department/unit and appropriate college listed in 8C of this form.

The administering department/unit is responsible for obtaining concurrence from all participating units, where a joint appointment exists or where key personnel are listed that reside outside the administering department/unit, prior to proposal submission. By signing this routing form, the Department Chairperson/Director of the administering department/unit, or designee, attests that this concurrence has been received. Appropriate signatures must be obtained on lines a), b), and c) before sending to ORA.

a) Principal Investigator/Co-Principal Investigator(s)  

Date  

Date  

Date  

b) Department Chairperson or Director  

Date  

Date  

c) Dean  

Date  

Date  

d) Division of Research/ORA  

Date
### Prepare to Apply

- **Find funding opportunity**
  - Register for SPIN Plus ([http://www.infoedglobal.com](http://www.infoedglobal.com)) to receive funding alerts.

- **Obtain necessary software**
  - Review funding opportunity to determine if PDF generator or viewer software is needed.

- **Create or update profiles in electronic systems**
  - Update profiles in NSF FastLane, NIH eRA Commons, NASA NSPIRES, etc.

- **Attend training sessions**
  - Grants.gov trainings are offered regularly and system-specific trainings can be provided.

### Develop Proposal

- **Prepare proposal**
  - Refer to the sponsor’s directions for content and formatting guidelines.

- **Acquire and complete required forms**
  - Complete required forms. For applications that require Grants.gov submissions, download the Grant Application Package from Grants.gov.

- **Questions?**
  - Contact your Contract Administrator ([http://ora.umd.edu/staff](http://ora.umd.edu/staff)).

### Acquire Approvals

- **Complete the Internal Routing Form**
  - ([http://ora.umd.edu/forms/umd](http://ora.umd.edu/forms/umd))

- **Obtain signatures of approval from:**
  - Principal Investigator
  - Co-Principal Investigator(s)
  - Department Chairperson/Unit Head or designee of administering unit
  - Next higher level of authority within school of administering unit; ex. Dean or VP of administering unit.

### Route to ORA

- **Route original signed proposal and one copy to ORA for review and approval.**
  - ORA provides the final University-authorized signature.
  - Be sure to allow enough time for review. Complex proposals, proposals involving multiple departments or multiple institutions, Requests for Proposals (RFPs), or proposals that include cost sharing may take longer to review.

- **Routing Proposals for Electronic Submission**
  - Route 1 hard copy of the proposal and complete signed Routing Form to ORA 6 business days before submission.
  - Upload complete and final Grants.gov electronic proposals to [http://ora.umd.edu/esubmissions/grantsgov](http://ora.umd.edu/esubmissions/grantsgov) no later than 48 hours before deadline
  - Grants.gov proposals for NIH and NSF are required to be uploaded 6 business days before the deadline.
  - **OR**
    - Provide submit access to proposals at least 24 hours before deadline in systems where PI prepares the proposal online, ex. NSF FastLane.

### Submit to Sponsor

- **Hard copy proposals** – ORA will notify the department for pickup so department can mail to the sponsor.
- **Electronic proposals** – ORA will submit to sponsor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submitting Organization</strong></td>
<td>University of Maryland (Do not list department name in this section.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Business Address &amp; Address for Official Correspondence</strong></td>
<td>Office of Research Administration 3112 Lee Building 7809 Regents Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Park, Maryland, 20742-5141 Phone: (301) 405-6269 Fax: (301) 314-9569 E-mail: <a href="mailto:oraa@umd.edu">oraa@umd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Organization</strong></td>
<td>State Institution of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congressional District</strong></td>
<td>MD-005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official Authorized to Sign Proposals</strong></td>
<td>Check with your Contract Administrator, or enter: Antoinette Lawson,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Office of Research Administration (ORA is the designated signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Official, DO NOT sign in these spaces.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Contact and Sponsored Project Payment Address</strong></td>
<td>Office of Contract &amp; Grant Accounting 4101 Chesapeake Building 4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrapin Trail University of Maryland College Park, MD 20742-3141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: (301) 405-2607 Fax: (301) 314-9889 E-mail: <a href="mailto:ocga@umd.edu">ocga@umd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Cognizant Audit Agency</strong></td>
<td>DHHS Office of Audit, Region III 150 South Independence Mall West,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 316 Philadelphia, PA 19106-3499 (215) 861-4470 Point of contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Virbitsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrator or Business Administrator Contact Assigned to Department</strong></td>
<td>List ORA Contract Administrator (CA) Name Refer to <a href="http://ora.umd.edu/staff">http://ora.umd.edu/staff</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Assurance Numbers</strong></td>
<td>IRB FWA: 00005856 ACUC: A3270-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J1 Visa Designation Number</strong></td>
<td>P-1-0793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal Investigator, Project Director, or Technical Contact</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member’s name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Address</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member’s or Department’s Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employer Federal ID Number/IRS Number (also known as TIN)</strong></td>
<td>52-6002033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHHS/PHS/Dept. of Ed. Entity ID Number (also known as EIN)</strong></td>
<td>1520710851-A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use on Grants.gov forms for all DHHS, NIH, PHS, and Dept. of Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUNS Number (Dun &amp; Bradstreet Number)</strong></td>
<td>79-093-4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAGE Code</strong> (Commercial and Government Entity Code)</td>
<td>0UB92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NAICS Code</strong> (North American Industry Classification System Code)</td>
<td>611310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Formerly SIC - Standard Industrial Code)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DHHS-PHS PIN</strong> (Use for USDA-NIFA proposals) or ASAP Information (also</td>
<td>6J84P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2451208 (Recipient ID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIH Institutional Profile Number</strong></td>
<td>820102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSF Institution Code</strong></td>
<td>00-2103-0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FICE Code</strong> (Federal Interagency Committee on Education Code)</td>
<td>002103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONR Administrative Contracting Office</strong></td>
<td>Office of Naval Research Atlanta Regional Office 100 Alabama St., NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 4R15 Atlanta, GA 30303-3104 (404) 562-1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Facilities &amp; Administrative Cost Agreement</strong> (Formerly Indirect</td>
<td>June 28, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Rate Agreement)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DS-2 Audit Date</strong></td>
<td>January 10, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCAA Accounting System Approval Date &amp; Audit Number</strong></td>
<td>August 12, 2009 Audit Number 9871-2009M17740018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard F&amp;A Rates</strong> – calculated as percentage of Modified Total</td>
<td>52% On-Campus Research 27.5% Off-Campus Adjacent 26% Off-Campus Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Cost (MTDC) see website for additional rates: <a href="http://ora.umd.edu/">http://ora.umd.edu/</a></td>
<td>56% Instruction 38.5% Other Sponsored Activity 10% IPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources/fa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fringe Benefits</strong> – there is no standard rate, actual costs are</td>
<td>Refer to <a href="http://ora.umd.edu/resources/benefits-stipends">http://ora.umd.edu/resources/benefits-stipends</a> Generally,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charged</td>
<td>25-30% of salary for full-time employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact your ORA Contract Administrator for assistance if sponsor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires information not provided above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RATE AGREEMENT

EIN: 15-20710851

DATE: 06/28/2012

FILING REF.: The preceding agreement was dated 06/07/2011

ORGANIZATION:
University of Maryland - College Park
1132 Main Administration Building
College Park, MD 20742-5035

The rates approved in this agreement are for use on grants, contracts and other agreements with the Federal Government, subject to the conditions in Section III.

SECTION I: INDIRECT COST RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE TYPES:</th>
<th>FIXED</th>
<th>FINAL</th>
<th>PROV. (PROVISIONAL)</th>
<th>PRED. (PREDETERMINED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFFECTIVE PERIOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>RATE(%)</td>
<td>LOCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>On-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2011</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>On-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>Off-Campus (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>Off-Campus (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2011</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>On-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2011</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>On-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>Off-Campus (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>Off-Campus (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>38.50</td>
<td>On-Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>Off-Campus (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>Off-Campus (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED.</td>
<td>07/01/2010</td>
<td>06/30/2015</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Off-Campus (A) &amp; (B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total direct costs excluding capital expenditures (buildings, individual items of equipment; alterations and renovations), that portion of each subaward in excess of $25,000; hospitalization and other fees associated with patient care whether the services are obtained from an owned, related or third party hospital or other medical facility; rental/maintenance of off-site activities; student tuition remission and student support costs (e.g., student aid, stipends, dependency allowances, scholarships, fellowships).

(A) Off-Campus, Remote - Activities performed outside commuting area of College Park, Maryland.

(B) Off-Campus, Adjacent - Activities performed within commuting area of College Park, Maryland.

IPA* - Intergovernmental Personnel Act Agreements
SECTION II: SPECIAL REMARKS

TREATMENT OF FRINGE BENEFITS:
The fringe benefits are specifically identified to each employee and are charged individually as direct costs. The directly claimed fringe benefits are listed below.

TREATMENT OF PAID ABSENCES
Vacation, holiday, sick leave pay and other paid absences are included in salaries and wages and are claimed on grants, contracts and other agreements as part of the normal cost for salaries and wages. Separate claims are not made for the cost of these paid absences.

OFF-SITE DEFINITION: For all activities performed in facilities not owned by the organization and to which rent is directly allocated to the project(s), the off-site rate will apply. Projects partially performed off-site are apportioned between their on-site/off-site components when projects activity is conducted off-site for at least three consecutive months.

Fringe Benefits Include: FICA, Retirement, Tuition Remission, Vision Care, TIAA/CREF, Unemployment Insurance and Health Insurance.

Equipment means an article of nonexpendable tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year, and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.

The RESEARCH base includes University expenditures related to grants and contracts conducted at the following facilities: Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension Service.

Effective 07/01/10, the RESEARCH base no longer includes grants and contracts conducted by the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBI). The Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology (CARB) is now the Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research (IBBR) and is a department of the University of Maryland - College Park.

This is an amendment of the June 7, 2011 Rate Agreement to include Off-Campus, Adjacent rates for Instruction and Other Spons Activities. All other terms and conditions are unchanged.
SECTION III: GENERAL

A. LIMITATIONS:
The rates in this Agreement are subject to any statutory or administrative limitations and apply to a given grant, contract or other agreement only to the extent that funds are available. Acceptance of the rates is subject to the following conditions: (1) Only costs incurred by the organization were included in its facilities and administrative cost pools as finally accepted; such costs are legal obligations of the organization and are allowable under the governing cost principles; (2) The same costs that have been treated as facilities and administrative costs are not claimed as direct costs; (3) Similar types of costs have been accorded consistent accounting treatment; and (4) The information provided by the organization which was used to establish the rates is not later found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate by the Federal Government. In such situations the rate(s) would be subject to renegotiation at the discretion of the Federal Government.

B. ACCOUNTING CHANGES:
This Agreement is based on the accounting system purported by the organization to be in effect during the Agreement period. Changes to the method of accounting for costs which affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from the use of this Agreement require prior approval of the authorized representative of the cognizant agency. Such changes include, but are not limited to, changes in the charging of a particular type of cost from facilities and administrative to direct. Failure to obtain approval may result in cost disallowances.

C. FIXED RATES:
If a fixed rate is in this Agreement, it is based on an estimate of the costs for the period covered by the rate. When the actual costs for this period are determined, an adjustment will be made to a rate of a future year(s) to compensate for the difference between the costs used to establish the fixed rate and actual costs.

D. USE BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES:
The rates in this Agreement were approved in accordance with the authority in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21 Circular, and should be applied to grants, contracts and other agreements covered by this Circular, subject to any limitations in A above. The organization may provide copies of the Agreement to other Federal Agencies to give them early notification of the Agreement.

E. OTHER:
If any Federal contract, grant or other agreement is reimbursing facilities and administrative costs by a means other than the approved rate(s) in this Agreement, the organization should (1) credit such costs to the affected programs, and (2) apply the approved rate(s) to the appropriate base to identify the proper amount of facilities and administrative costs allocable to these programs.

BY THE INSTITUTION:
University of Maryland - College Park

(SIGNATURE)
Wallace D. Loh

(NAME)
President

(DATE) 7/6/2012

ON BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

(AGENCY)

(SIGNATURE)
Darryl W. Mayes

(NAME)
Director, Mid-Atlantic Field Office

(TITLE)

(DATE) 6/28/2012

SHS REPRESENTATIVE:
Steven Zuraf

(Telephone) (301) 492-4055
# Components of Published Facilities and Administrative Cost Rate

**University of Maryland, College Park**

**July 01, 2010 - June 30, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE COMPONENTS:</th>
<th>Organized Research</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Other Sponsored Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ON FY'11</td>
<td>ON FY'12 - '15</td>
<td>OFF FY'11 '15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg &amp; Improv - Depr/Use Allow</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment - Depr/Use Allow</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Component</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concurrence:**

Wallace D. Loh
Name

President
Title

7/6/2012
Date
August 13, 2013

Mr. Darryl W. Mayes
Deputy Director
Division of Cost Allocation
Department of Health and Human Services
7700 Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 2300
Bethesda, MD 20814

Dear Mr. Mayes:

Enclosed is the original of the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement dated July 25, 2013 between the University of Maryland, College Park and Department of Health and Human Services. The Agreement has been signed by Dr. Wallace D. Loh, President. The Agreement is in accordance with the terms of our recent negotiations.

Should you have any questions concerning the Agreement, please call me at (301) 405-5101.

Sincerely yours,

Edward C. Waskiewicz
Director

ECW:of
Enclosure
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RATE AGREEMENT

EIN: 15-20710851
ORGANIZATION:
University of Maryland - College Park
1132 Main Administration Building
College Park, MD 20742-5035

DATE: 07/25/2013
FILING REF.: The preceding agreement was dated 06/28/2012

The rates approved in this agreement are for use on grants, contracts and other agreements with the Federal Government, subject to the conditions in Section III.

SECTION I: Facilities And Administrative Cost Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATE TYPES: FIXED FINAL PROV. (PROVISIONAL) PRED. (PREDETERMINED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTIVE PERIOD</th>
<th>RATE(%) LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>52.00 On-Campus (A)</td>
<td>Organized Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus (A)</td>
<td>Organized Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>27.50 Off-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>56.00 On-Campus (A)</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>27.50 Off-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>38.50 On-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>26.00 Off-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>27.50 Off-Campus (B)</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED. 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016</td>
<td>10.00 Off-Campus (A) &amp; (B)</td>
<td>Other Sponsored Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORGANIZATION: University of Maryland - College Park
AGREEMENT DATE: 7/25/2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>RATE (%)</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROV.</td>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>Until Amended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use same rates and conditions as those cited for fiscal year ending June 30, 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASE**

Total direct costs excluding capital expenditures (buildings, individual items of equipment; alterations and renovations), that portion of each subaward in excess of $25,000; hospitalization and other fees associated with patient care whether the services are obtained from an owned, related or third party hospital or other medical facility; rental/maintenance of off-site activities; student tuition remission and student support costs (e.g., student aid, stipends, dependency allowances, scholarships, fellowships).

(A) Off-Campus, Remote - Activities performed outside commuting area of College Park, Maryland.

(B) Off-Campus, Adjacent - Activities performed within commuting area of College Park, Maryland.

IPA* - Intergovernmental Personnel Act Agreements
SECTION II: SPECIAL REMARKS

TREATMENT OF FRINGE BENEFITS:

The fringe benefits are specifically identified to each employee and are charged individually as direct costs. The directly claimed fringe benefits are listed below.

TREATMENT OF PAID ABSENCES

Vacation, holiday, sick leave pay and other paid absences are included in salaries and wages and are claimed on grants, contracts and other agreements as part of the normal cost for salaries and wages. Separate claims are not made for the cost of these paid absences.

OFF-SITE DEFINITION: For all activities performed in facilities not owned by the organization and to which rent is directly allocated to the project(s), the off-site rate will apply. Projects partially performed off-site are apportioned between their on-site/off-site components when projects activity is conducted off-site for at least three consecutive months.

Fringe Benefits Include: FICA, Retirement, Tuition Remission, Vision Care, TIAA/CREF, Unemployment Insurance and Health Insurance.

Equipment means an article of nonexpendable tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year, and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.

The RESEARCH base includes University expenditures related to grants and contracts conducted at the following facilities: Agricultural Experiment Station, Cooperative Extension Service.

Effective 07/01/10, the RESEARCH base no longer includes grants and contracts conducted by the University of Maryland Biotechnology Institute (UMBPI). The Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology (CARB) is now the Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research (IBBR) and is a department of the University of Maryland - College Park.

This is an amendment of the June 7, 2011 Rate Agreement to include Off-Campus, Adjacent rates for Instruction and Other Spons Activities. All other terms and conditions are unchanged.
SECTION III: GENERAL

A. LIMITATIONS:

The rates in this Agreement are subject to any statutory or administrative limitations and apply to a given grant, contract or other agreement only to the extent that funds are available. Acceptance of the rates is subject to the following conditions: (1) only costs incurred by the organization were included in its facilities and administrative cost pools as finally accepted; such costs are legal obligations of the organization and are allowable under the governing cost principles; (2) The same costs that have been treated as facilities and administrative costs are not claimed as direct costs; (3) Similar types of costs have been accorded consistent accounting treatment; and (4) The information provided by the organization which was used to establish the rates is not later found to be materially incomplete or inaccurate by the Federal Government. In such situations the rate(s) would be subject to renegotiation at the discretion of the Federal Government.

B. ACCOUNTING CHANGES:

This Agreement is based on the accounting system purported by the organization to be in effect during the Agreement period. Changes to the method of accounting for costs which affect the amount of reimbursement resulting from the use of this Agreement require prior approval of the authorized representative of the cognizant agency. Such changes include, but are not limited to, changes in the charging of a particular type of cost from facilities and administrative to direct. Failure to obtain approval may result in cost disallowances.

C. FIXED RATES:

If a fixed rate is in this Agreement, it is based on an estimate of the costs for the period covered by the rate. When the actual costs for this period are determined, an adjustment will be made to a rate of a future year(s) to compensate for the difference between the costs used to establish the fixed rate and actual costs.

D. USE BY OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES:

The rates in this Agreement were approved in accordance with the authority in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21, and should be applied to grants, contracts and other agreements covered by this Circular, subject to any limitations in A above. The organization may provide copies of the Agreement to other Federal Agencies to give them early notification of the Agreement.

E. OTHER:

If any Federal contract, grant or other agreement is reimbursing facilities and administrative costs by a method other than the approved rate(s) in this Agreement, the organization should (1) credit such costs to the affected programs, and (2) apply the approved rate(s) to the appropriate base to identify the proper amount of facilities and administrative costs allocable to those programs.

BY THE INSTITUTION:

University of Maryland - College Park

(INSTITUTION)

Wallace D. Loh

(SIGNATURE)

(NAME)

President

(TITLE)

August 12, 2013

(DATE)

OF BEHALF OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

(AGENCY)

Darryl W. Mayes

(SIGNATURE)

(NAME)

Deputy Director, Division of Cost Allocation

(TITLE)

7/25/2013

(DATE) 0415

HHS REPRESENTATIVE: Steven Zuraf

Telephones: (301) 492-4855