

Appendix

NCER 2014 84.305H Survey

<https://surveys.ies.ed.gov/?305Hsurvey2014>

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 10 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. How did you first learn about this grant opportunity at IES?

- Read about it on the IES website
- Read about it on another website
- Read about it in a newsletter or journal
- Read about it in the IES newsflash
- Heard about it from an IES staff member
- Heard about it from a co-worker, friend, or colleague
- Other
- If #1 = Other, then go to #2
- If #1 = all other responses, then go to #3

2. Provide the mechanism indicated as "Other" in the previous item that you learned about this grant opportunity.

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

3. Including the application(s) you submitted for the FY14 RFA, how many IES grant applications have you submitted as the Principal Investigator? (Count previous submissions of the same application as distinct applications.)
- 1
 - 2-3
 - 4+
4. Did you submit a letter of intent for the FY14 RFA?
- Yes
 - No
5. 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
6. Rate the level of difficulty of locating important material in the RFA.
- Not at all Difficult
 - Somewhat Difficult
 - Difficult
 - Very Difficult
7. Did you contact an IES program officer as you prepared your application(s) for the FY2014 competition?
- Yes
 - No
 - ➔ If #7 = No, then go to #10
 - ➔ If #7 = Yes, then go to #8
8. 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 Partnerships and Collaborations Focused on Problems of Practice or Policy program
 - Question(s) about the topics described in the RFA
 - Questions about partnerships for your proposed study
 - 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 #8 = Other, then go to #9
 - ➔ If #8 = all other responses, then go to #10
9. 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.

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

Yes

No

➔ If #10 = No, then go to #13

➔ If #10 = Yes, then go to #11

11. Rate the utility of the webinar(s) in which you participated.

Highly Useful

Useful

Marginally Useful

Not Useful

➔ If #11 = Highly Useful, then go to #13

➔ If #11 = Useful, Marginally Useful, or Not Useful, then go to #12

12. Comment on how the webinar could be more useful.

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

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

Yes

No

14. Did you read the information in Part I: General Overview of the RFA?

Yes

No

➔ If #14 = No, then go to #17.

➔ If #14 = Yes, then go to #15-16.

15. Rate the clarity of the Changes in the FY 2014 Request for Applications section of the RFA (p. 6).

Very Clear

Somewhat Clear

Somewhat Unclear

Very Unclear

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 eligibility requirements for the partners (discussed on pp. 7-8), regarding:

a. the education agency

Very Clear

Somewhat Clear

Somewhat Unclear

Very Unclear

- b. the research institution.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. the inclusion of other partners.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

18. Rate the clarity of the information provided under Part V: General Submission and Review Information (pp. 40-52).

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

19. Please comment on any language about the eligibility requirements that were unclear to you. Provide specific examples if possible.

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

20. Did you submit an application as the PI to the Research-Practitioner Partnerships in Education Research topic?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #20 = No, then go to #26.
- ➔ If #20 = Yes, then go to #21-25.

21. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The Purpose section (p. 10).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The section on the Significance of the Researcher-Practitioner Partnership (pp. 11-13).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The section on the Partnership and Research Plan (pp. 13-15).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The types of research that can be done.

- Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The requirements for your plans for future research (p. 15).
- Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The requirements for tracking the progress and success of your partnership (p. 15).
- Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

22. Please comment on any language or concepts that were unclear to you. Provide specific examples if possible.

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

23. As you interpreted the RFA, what do you think was the right balance between partnership activities and research activities?
- 25% partnership and 75% research
 - 40% partnership and 60% research
 - 50% partnership and 50% research
 - 60% partnership and 40% research
 - 75% partnership and 25% research

24. Was your partnership newly formed in response to this RFA?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #24 = No, then go to #25
- ➔ If #24 = Yes, then, go to #26

25. How long has your partnership been in place?

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

26. Did you submit an application as the PI to the Continuous Improvement Research in Education topic?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #26 = No, then go to #30
- ➔ If #26 = Yes, then go to #27-29

27. Rate the clarity of...

- a. The Purpose section (pp. 18-19).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- b. The Significance section (pp. 20-21).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- c. The requirement that the partnership has worked together for at least 1 year.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- d. The Research Plan section (pp. 21-23).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The types of research that can be done.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The short cycle method.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The continuous improvement process (pp. 21-22).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. The requirements for the pilot study (p. 23).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- i. The requirements for tracking the progress and success of your partnership (p. 23).
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

28. Please comment on any language or concepts that were unclear to you. Provide specific examples if possible.

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

29. How long has your partnership been in place?

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

30. Did you submit an application as the PI to the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies topic?

Yes

No

➔ If #30 = No, then go to #33

➔ If #30 = Yes, then go to #31-32

31. Rate the clarity of...

a. The Purpose section (pp. 27-28).

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

b. The Significance section (pp. 28-31).

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

c. The Research Plan section (pp. 31-37).

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

d. The instructions for an acceptable program or policy for evaluation.

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

e. The instructions for describing the program or policy.

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

f. The instructions for an acceptable research design.

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

g. The instructions for the cost analysis plan (p. 37).

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

h. The instructions for the dissemination plan.

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

32. Please comment on any language or concepts that were unclear to you. Provide specific examples if possible.

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

33. Rate the clarity of the RFA on:

a. The content to include in the Personnel section of the application.

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

b. The content to include in the Resources section of the application.

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

c. Ensuring the responsiveness of your project narrative (Section E).

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

d. The importance of developing new capabilities within the agency during the research project.

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

e. The importance of the education agency setting the main objective(s) for the research project.

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

34. 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.