

Appendix

NCER 2014 84.305A Survey

<https://surveys.ies.ed.gov/?305Asurvey2014>

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1880-0542. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average no more than 15 minutes per response, including the time to review the instructions and complete the survey. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave, SW Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to Christina Chhin, U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, CP-611A, Washington, DC 20202.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your feedback is important to helping IES improve its grants program.

If you need assistance completing this survey, please contact IES/NCER by sending an email to NCER.Commissioner@ed.gov

The password for this survey is 2014RFA.

Please enter the password to access this survey:

START→

-
1. Including the application(s) you submitted to the Education Research Grants (CFDA# 84.305A) FY 2014 Request for Applications (RFA), how many IES grant applications have you submitted as the Principal Investigator? (Count previous submissions of the same application as separate distinct applications.)
 - 1
 - 2-3
 - 4+
 2. Did you submit a letter of intent for the FY14 RFA?
 - Yes
 - No
 3. To which Topic(s) did you apply in response to the FY14 RFA?
 - Cognition and Student Learning
 - Early Learning Programs and Policies
 - Education Technology
 - Effective Teachers and Effective Teaching

- English Learners
- Improving Education Systems: Policies, Organization, Management, and Leadership
- Mathematics and Science Education
- Postsecondary and Adult Education
- Reading and Writing
- Social and Behavioral Context for Academic Learning

4. Rate the level of difficulty of keeping track of the requirements set forth in the RFA.

- Not at all Difficult
- Somewhat Difficult
- Difficult
- Very Difficult

5. Rate the level of difficulty of locating important material in the RFA.

- Not at all Difficult
- Somewhat Difficult
- Difficult
- Very Difficult

6. The RFA uses prior research and other descriptions of research as examples of potential areas of inquiry for applicants. Do you find these examples helpful?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #6 = No, then go to #7.
- ➔ If #6 = Yes, then go to #8.

7. Please comment on how the examples could be improved.

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

8. Did you interpret these examples as indicative of IES research priorities?

- Yes
- No

9. Did you contact an IES program officer as you prepared your application(s) for the FY2014 competition?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #9 = No, then go to #12
- ➔ If #9 = Yes, then go to #10

10. For what reason(s) did you contact an IES program officer? (Please check all that apply.)

- Question(s) about the suitability of the study for the Education Research Grants program
- Question(s) about the Topics described in the RFA
- Question(s) about the Goals described in the RFA
- Question(s) about the budget for your proposed study
- Question(s) about your eligibility to apply

- € Question(s) about the application process
- € Question(s) about the review process
- € Question(s) about resubmitting a previous application that was not funded
- € Other
- ➔ If #10 = Other, then go to #11
- ➔ If #10 = all other responses, then go to #12

11. Provide the reason indicated as “Other” in the previous item that you contacted an IES program officer.

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

12. Have you participated in an IES webinar since the RFA was released?

- € Yes
- € No
- ➔ If # 12 = No, then go to 14
- ➔ If #12 = Yes, then go to 13

13. Rate the utility of the webinar(s) in which you participated for preparing your application.

- Highly Useful
- Useful
- Marginally Useful
- Not Useful

14. Did you view/download the transcript and/or the slides from a webinar on the IES website?

- € Yes
- € No

15. Did you read the information in Part I: Overview and General Requirements Section of the RFA (pp. 6-13)?

- € Yes
- € No
- ➔ If #15 = No, then go to #18.
- ➔ If #15 = Yes, then go to #16-17.

16. Rate the clarity of the Focus on Student Outcomes section of the RFA (pp. 6-7).

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear

17. Rate the clarity of the Changes in the FY 2014 Request for Applications section of the RFA (pp. 11-13).

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear

18. Rate the overall clarity of Part IV of the RFA, General Submission and Review Information (pp. 84-100).

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear
- N/A – Did not read this section

19. How many Topic sections did you read in the RFA?

- 0
- 1
- 2-3
- 4+
- ➔ If #19 = 0, then go to #26
- ➔ If #19 = 1, then go to #22-25.
- ➔ If #19 > 1, then go to #20-25.

20. Which Topic section(s) did you read in the RFA? (Check all that you read.)

- Cognition and Student Learning
- Early Learning Programs and Policies
- Education Technology
- Effective Teachers and Effective Teaching
- English Learners
- Improving Education Systems: Policies, Organization, Management, and Leadership
- Mathematics and Science Education
- Postsecondary and Adult Education
- Reading and Writing
- Social and Behavioral Context for Academic Learning

21. Comment on the clarity of the differences among the Topics.

Text Box – Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

22. After reading the topic sections, was the topic to which you should apply clear?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #22 = No, then go to #23
- ➔ If #22 = Yes, then go to #24

23. In what way(s) was the topic to which you should apply not clear?

Text Box – Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

24. Rate the utility of the Background and Current Portfolio section described under the Topic in the RFA.

- Highly Useful
- Useful

- Marginally Useful
- Not Useful
- N/A - Did not read this section

25. Rate the clarity of the information in the Application Requirements section described under the Topic in the RFA.

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear
- N/A - Did not read this section

26. How carefully did you read the Exploration Goal of the RFA?

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #26 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to # 28.
- ➔ If #26 = Thoroughly, then go to #27.

27. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The purpose of the Exploration Goal.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The expected outcomes/products for Exploration projects.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The conditions under which it is acceptable to do small-scale experiments.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The description of the types of research questions allowed for an Exploration project.
 - Very Clear

- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear
- g. The definition of *malleable factors*.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

28. How carefully did you read the Development & Innovation Goal of the RFA?

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #28 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to #31.
- ➔ If #28 = Thoroughly, then go to #29-30.

29. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The purpose of the Development & Innovation Goal.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The expected outcomes/products for Development & Innovation projects.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The expectations for the iterative development.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The distinction between *feasibility* and *usability*.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

- g. The requirement that measures of fidelity of implementation be developed/refined as part of a Development & Innovation project.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. The continuum of rigor for the pilot study.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

30. Comment on the adequacy of the maximum of 35% of the budget being used to conduct the pilot study.

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

31. How carefully did you read the Efficacy & Replication Goal of the RFA?

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #31 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to # 33.
- ➔ If #31 = Thoroughly, then go to #32.

32. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The purpose of the Efficacy & Replication Goal.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The expected outcomes/products for Efficacy & Replication projects.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

- e. The differences among the forms of Efficacy & Replication studies (i.e., efficacy, replication, follow-up, and retrospective).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The differences in the requirements between studying widely used interventions and studying not widely used interventions.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The requirement that fidelity of implementation be measured during the first year of implementation of the intervention.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. The recommendation that there be a plan for altering the research prior to the second year of intervention, if it is found that fidelity of implementation is low.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

33. How carefully did you read the Effectiveness Goal of the RFA?

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #33 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to #36.
- ➔ If #33 = Thoroughly, then go to #34-35.

34. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The purpose of the Effectiveness Goal.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The expected outcomes/products for Effectiveness projects.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear

- o Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- e. The requirement that fidelity of implementation be measured during the first year of implementation of the intervention.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- f. The distinction between the purposes of the Efficacy & Replication Goal and the Effectiveness Goal.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
 - o N/A - Did not read the Efficacy & Replication Goal
- g. The requirements for the Data Sharing Plan.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear

35. If you had been considering doing an Effectiveness study but then decided against it, what motivated that decision?

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

36. How carefully did you read the Measurement Goal of the RFA?

- o Did not read it
- o Casually
- o Thoroughly
- ➔ If #36 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to # 38.
- ➔ If #36 = Thoroughly, then go to #37.

37. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The purpose of the Measurement Goal.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- b. The expected outcomes/products for Measurement projects.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear

- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The differences among the types of Measurement studies (i.e., design a new assessment, refine an existing assessment, or collect validity evidence for an existing assessment).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

38. After reading the goal sections, was the goal to which you should apply clear?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #38 = No, then go to #39
- ➔ If #39 = Yes, then go to #40

39. In what way(s) was the topic to which you should apply not clear?

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

40. Rate the clarity of the recommendations for the dissemination plan.

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear

41. In what way(s), did the dissemination plan recommendations factor into the choices you made for the personnel to include on your application?

Text Box - Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

42. Rate the clarity of the description of the Personnel section of the application.

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear

43. Rate the clarity of the description of the Resources section of the application.

- Very Clear
- Somewhat Clear
- Somewhat Unclear
- Very Unclear

44. Please comment on any language or instructions in the RFA that were unclear to you. Provide specific examples if possible.

Text Box – Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

45. Please give us any additional feedback you may have about the RFA, including comments on the length, the level of detail, and the organization.

Text Box – Maximum 4,000 characters (about 500 words). Longer responses may be truncated.

Thank you for contributing your time and thoughtful responses to this important survey. If you have any questions about this survey, please feel free to contact IES/NCER by e-mail at NCER.Commissioner@ed.gov