

NCER 2015 84.305A Survey

<https://surveys.ies.ed.gov/?305Asurvey2015>

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1880-0542. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The obligation to respond to this collection is voluntary. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this survey, please contact Christina Chhin directly at, U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, CP-611A, Washington, DC 20202. [Note: Please do not return the completed survey to this address.]

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 **2015RFA**.

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 2015 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 applications.)
 - 1
 - 2-3
 - 4+
 - If #1 = 1, then go to #3.
 - If #1 = 2-3 or 4+, then go to #2.
 2. Compared to Education Research Grants Program (84.305A) RFAs from previous years, the clarity and organization of the FY 2015 RFA is _____
 - much better.
 - somewhat better.
 - no better or worse.
 - somewhat worse.
 - much worse.

3. To which Topic(s) did you apply in response to the FY15 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 clarity of the distinction in the RFA between application requirements and application recommendations.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

5. Each RFA Topic section includes a description of research gaps. Did you find these descriptions helpful?
 - Yes
 - No
 - ➔ If #5 = No, then go to #6.
 - ➔ If #5 = Yes, then go to #7.

6. Please comment on how the descriptions of the research gaps could be improved.

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

7. Did you interpret these research gaps as indicative of IES research priorities?
 - Yes
 - No

8. Did you contact an IES program officer as you prepared your application(s) for the FY2015 competition?
 - Yes
 - No
 - ➔ If #8 = No, then go to #11
 - ➔ If #8 = Yes, then go to #9

9. 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 #9 = Other, then go to #10
- ➔ If #9 = all other responses, then go to #11

10. 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.

11. Rate the clarity of the Student Education Outcomes section of the RFA (pp. 2-3).

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

12. Rate the clarity of the Authentic Education Settings section of the RFA (pp. 2-3).

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

13. Rate the overall clarity of Part IV of the RFA, Competition Regulations and Review Criteria (pp. 76-80).

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

14. Rate the overall clarity of Part V of the RFA, Preparing Your Application (pp. 81-88).

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

15. Rate the overall clarity of Part VI of the RFA, Submitting Your Application (pp. 89-113).

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

- N/A – Did not read this section

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

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

17. Having the RFA and the Application Submission Guide combined into a single document is _____ than having them be separate documents.

- much better
- somewhat better
- no better or worse
- somewhat worse
- much worse

18. Rate the utility of the Glossary.

- Highly Useful
- Useful
- Marginally Useful
- Not Useful
- I did not notice the Glossary

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

- 0
- 1
- 2-3
- 4+
- ➔ If #19 = 0, then go to #24
- ➔ If #19 = 1, then go to #21.
- ➔ If #19 > 1, then go to #20.

20. Which Topic sections 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. After reading the Topic section(s), was the Topic to which you should apply clear?

- Yes
- No
- ➔ If #21 = No, then go to #22

➔ If #21 = Yes, then go to #23.

22. 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.

23. Rate the clarity of the information in the Requirements section (i.e., Sample, Outcomes, and Setting) described under the Topic in the RFA.

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

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

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #24 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to #26.
- ➔ If #24 = Thoroughly, then go to #25.

25. 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 description of the Personnel section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear

- Very Unclear
- f. The description of the Resources section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The description of the types of research questions allowed for an Exploration project.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. The description of laboratory research.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- i. The definition of malleable factors.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

26. How carefully did you read the Development & Innovation 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 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 description of the Personnel section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The description of the Resources section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The description of the theory of change.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. The expectations for the iterative development.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- i. The distinction between *feasibility* and *usability*.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- j. 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
- k. The description of laboratory research.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- l. The continuum of rigor for the pilot study.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

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

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

29. 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 description of the Personnel section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The description of the Resources section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The description of the theory of change.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. 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
- i. The differences in the requirements between studying widely used interventions and studying not widely used interventions.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- j. The requirements for the Cost Analysis.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- k. The requirements for the Data Management Plan.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

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

- Did not read it
- Casually
- Thoroughly
- ➔ If #30 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to #32.
- ➔ If #30 = Thoroughly, then go to #31.

31. 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
 - Very Unclear
- d. The description of the Research Plan section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- e. The description of the Personnel section of the application.

- o Very Clear
- o Somewhat Clear
- o Somewhat Unclear
- o Very Unclear
- f. The description of the Resources section of the application.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- g. The description of the theory of change.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- h. 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
- i. The requirements for the Data Management Plan.
 - o Very Clear
 - o Somewhat Clear
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear

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

- o Did not read it
- o Casually
- o Thoroughly
- ➔ If #32 = Did not read it or Casually, then go to #34.
- ➔ If #32 = Thoroughly, then go to #33.

33. 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
 - o Somewhat Unclear
 - o Very Unclear
- c. The description of the Significance section of the application.
 - o 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 description of the Personnel section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- f. The description of the Resources section of the application.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- g. The description of the assessment framework.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear
- h. 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
- i. The description of laboratory research.
 - Very Clear
 - Somewhat Clear
 - Somewhat Unclear
 - Very Unclear

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

Yes

No

➔ If #34 = No, then go to #35

➔ If #34 = Yes, then go to #36

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

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

36. Rate the clarity of the requirements for the dissemination plan.

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

37. 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.

38. Please give us any additional feedback you may have about the RFA, including comments on the length, the level of detail, the organization, and comparisons to RFAs from previous years.

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 .