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 five core 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; professional development for faculty; scholarships for students; STEM education research; and other innovative tools and practices. These programs focus not only on promoting high-quality education in STEM fields but also on strengthening the diversity of undergraduate students and faculty and fostering collaborations that impact undergraduate education. 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 2,600 grant proposals each year. In keeping with NSF's standard requirements, each proposal contains a one-page project summary, a narrative project description (typically 15 pages), 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 each submission 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 that have discernible similarities, and a panel of external reviewers is identified to review and rate each subset of proposals. The reviewers read and submit reviews and ratings of their assigned proposals via NSF's Web-based research.gov system, and in many cases, the panels of reviewers subsequently convene either face-to-face at NSF or online via videoconference 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 external reviewers discuss proposals typically take place six weeks after the proposal deadline, and all panelists must complete their individual written reviews before the commencement of the panel meeting. 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 or anticipated impact of the grants that it awards. 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, underrepresented 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 estimated impact of the Division's programs.

Please note: the form was updated to include more categories for respondents.

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

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

3. **USE OF AUTOMATION**

The form will be available electronically in Research.gov, NSF's systems for preparing and submitting 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. As a result, the Division would have difficulty meeting 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 November 19, 2024, at 89 FR 92177, 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: 2,600 per year. Estimated total annual burden on respondents: 867 hours.

ANNUALIZED COST TO RESPONDENTS: $54,200

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 Research.gov: 20 hours = $1,250.

Time for program staff to examine proposals and to classify each one based on responses to the form: 3 minutes per proposal x 2,600 proposals = 130 hours = $8,125

Total annualized cost: $9,375

15. **CHANGES IN BURDEN**

There are no changes in the burden per respondent.

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