

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION SUBMISSION

TITLE OF COLLECTION: DUE Project Data Form (NSF Form 1295; OMB Control No. 3145-0201)

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. CIRCUMSTANCES MAKING COLLECTION OF INFORMATION NECESSARY

The National Science Foundation's Division of Undergraduate Education manages approximately eight grant programs that constitute a comprehensive approach to improving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education at two-year and four-year colleges and universities. These programs solicit and fund proposals for the development of innovative educational materials, courses, curricula, pedagogical techniques, and assessment instruments and methods; the acquisition of modern laboratory instrumentation and equipment; professional development for faculty; and scholarships for students. These programs focus not only on promoting high-quality education in STEM fields but also on strengthening the diversity of students and faculty and fostering collaborations. In its efforts to broaden participation in the nation's science and engineering enterprise, the Division encourages proposals from all types of educational institutions and particularly encourages activities that involve faculty and students from groups that have traditionally been underrepresented in STEM fields.

The Division receives approximately 2,500 grant proposals each year. Most of these are submitted for particular deadline dates, in response to a solicitation published for each program. In keeping with NSF's standard requirements, each proposal contains a one-page project summary, a narrative project description of 15 pages or less, biographical sketches of the investigators and other key project participants, budgets for each year of proposed work, a detailed justification for budget line items, and a list of current and pending support for each investigator or key participant. Although the Division's programs have different foci and audiences, it is typical for a program to receive several hundred proposals for its annual deadline. After the proposals are received, program staff must examine the proposals and assign each one to three or more external reviewers who have appropriate expertise to evaluate the content of the proposal. Typically, proposals are sorted into subsets of 10 to 12 that have discernible similarities, and a group of 4 to 6 external reviewers is identified to review and rate each subset of 10 to 12 proposals. The reviewers read and submit reviews and ratings of their assigned proposals via NSF's Web-based FastLane system, and the various groups of reviewers subsequently convene at NSF to discuss the proposals.

NSF endeavors to notify applicants of a decision on their proposal within six months of the proposal's submission. This goal necessitates a tight time frame for processing proposals after a program's proposal deadline. The panel meetings at which the external reviewers convene to discuss proposals typically take place approximately six weeks after the proposal deadline, and all reviewers must complete their individual written reviews before that time. Therefore, program staff must sort proposals (typically several hundred) and assign them to appropriate reviewers as quickly as possible after the proposal deadline. The DUE Project Data Form is used to make this sorting process efficient and accurate. The form requires the

applicant to identify particular characteristics of the proposed activities—e.g., the STEM field involved, the type of college or university submitting the proposal, the academic level on which the educational activities focus—that enable program staff to match the proposal with appropriate reviewers.

The Division must also periodically report on the impact of its programs. In particular, the Division is called on to answer questions regarding the number of students and faculty involved in grant activities and the number of individuals in specific groups (e.g., women, minorities, persons with disabilities, K-12 teachers) who are affected by the activities. Responses to questions on the DUE Project Data Form can be aggregated to provide data on the impact of the Division’s programs.

2. HOW, BY WHOM, AND PURPOSE FOR WHICH INFORMATION IS TO BE USED

Information from the form will be used by program officers in all of the Division’s programs to assign proposals to appropriate reviewers. Information will also be used by program officers, analysts, and the Division’s senior leaders to respond to inquiries and prepare narrative and statistical reports about the impact of the Division’s programs and the overall characteristics of proposals.

3. USE OF AUTOMATION

The form will be available electronically in NSF’s FastLane system and in Grants.gov, which are the two mechanisms that applicants may use to prepare and submit proposals.

4. EFFORTS TO IDENTIFY DUPLICATION

With the exception of the Principal Investigator’s name and the submitting institution’s name, none of the information requested on the form is requested on other forms. Because each proposal is unique, the information must be requested for each submission.

5. SMALL BUSINESS CONSIDERATIONS

N/A

6. CONSEQUENCES OF LESS FREQUENT COLLECTION

As a consequence of less frequent collection, the Division would not be able to assign proposals to reviewers efficiently and accurately, and the time required for the review process would be significantly lengthened because program staff would have to fully read each proposal and manually note its characteristics according to a rubric similar to the DUE Project Data Form before assigning the proposal to reviewers. The Division would no longer be able to meet NSF’s six-month goal for rendering decisions on proposals. In addition, the Division would not have necessary data to address questions and prepare reports about the impact of the Division’s programs and the overall characteristics of proposals.

7. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES FOR COLLECTION

There are no special circumstances.

8. FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE

The public notice was published in the *Federal Register* on June 6, 2012, at 77 FR 33496, and no comments were received.

OUTSIDE CONSULTATION

The form has been reviewed by the Division Director and NSF Forms Clearance Officer.

9. GIFTS OR REMUNERATION

N/A

10. CONFIDENTIALITY PROVIDED TO RESPONDENTS

The information requested on the form is solicited pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. Disclosure of all the information is voluntary. Information supplied will be used and disclosed only in connection with the review of proposals, and will not be disclosed for any other purpose, except as part of statistical reports in a form that would not allow identification of individual applicants. In the event of an award, the proposal becomes a public document.

11. QUESTIONS OF A SENSITIVE NATURE

No questions of a sensitive nature are asked.

12. ESTIMATE OF BURDEN

Estimated burden per response: 20 minutes. Estimated number of responses: 2,500 per year. Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 833 hours.

ANNUALIZED COST TO RESPONDENTS: \$25,000

13. CAPITAL/STARTUP COSTS

There are no capital or startup costs associated with this collection.

14. ANNUALIZED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Time for information technology staff to maintain the form in FastLane and Grants.gov: 20 hours = \$1,000.

Time for program staff to examine proposals and to classify each one based on responses to the form: 3 minutes per proposal x 2,500 proposals = 125 hours = \$6,250

Total annualized cost: \$7,250

15. CHANGES IN BURDEN

There are no changes in the burden.

16. PUBLICATION OF COLLECTION

N/A

17. SEEKING APPROVAL TO NOT DISPLAY OMB EXPIRATION DATE

NSF requests approval not to display the expiration date as it is anticipated that this form will not change.

18. EXCEPTION(S) TO THE CERTIFICATION STATEMENT (19) ON OMB 83-I

There are no exceptions.

B. STATISTICAL METHODS

N/A