

NSF 24-605: Cultural Anthropology Program - Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (CA-DDRIG)

Program Solicitation

Document Information

Document History

- **Posted:** September 12, 2024
- **Replaces:** [NSF 23-502](#)

[View the program page](#)



U.S. National Science Foundation

Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Sciences

Full Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

January 15, 2025

January 15, Annually Thereafter

August 15, 2025

August 15, Annually Thereafter



Table Of Contents

Summary of Program Requirements

I. Introduction

II. Program Description

III. Award Information

IV. Eligibility Information

V. Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

B. Budgetary Information

C. Due Dates

D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements

VI. NSF Proposal Processing and Review Procedures

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

B. Review and Selection Process

VII. Award Administration Information

A. Notification of the Award

B. Award Conditions

C. Reporting Requirements

VIII. Agency Contacts

IX. Other Information

Important Information And Revision Notes

- This solicitation provides instructions for preparation of proposals submitted to the Cultural Anthropology Program (CA) for Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (DDRIG).
- This revision replaces target dates with deadlines.
- This revision eliminates the requirement that if the proposal is a resubmission, the first paragraph of the project description must summarize how the proposal has responded to previous reviewer concerns.
- This revision does not alter the restriction that a DDRIG proposal may only be re-submitted once without a waiver for an additional submission.
- This revision reaffirms the explanation of NSF's mission to support fundamental research, rather than applied research, or descriptive ethnographic work with primarily humanistic or philosophical objectives, or non-generalizable data collection centered on describing a particular ethnographic site or sites.
- The revision includes additional budgetary guidance.
- Additional solicitation-specific guidelines are described in the proposal preparation and submission instructions below. Failure to comply with the CA-DDRIG solicitation-specific instructions may result in a proposal being returned without review.

Any proposal submitted in response to this solicitation should be submitted in accordance with the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) that is in effect for the relevant due date to which the proposal is being submitted. The NSF PAPPG is regularly revised and it is the responsibility of the proposer to ensure that the proposal meets the requirements specified in this solicitation and the applicable version of the PAPPG. Submitting a proposal prior to a specified deadline does not negate this requirement.

Summary Of Program Requirements

General Information

Program Title:

Cultural Anthropology Program - Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (CA-DDRIG)

Synopsis of Program:

The primary objective of the Cultural Anthropology Program is to support basic scientific research on the causes, consequences and complexities of human social and cultural variability.

Contemporary cultural anthropology is an arena in which diverse research traditions and methodologies are valid in investigations of human cultural variation. Recognizing the breadth of the field's contributions to science, the Cultural Anthropology Program welcomes proposals for empirically grounded, fieldwork/lab-based theoretically engaged and methodologically sophisticated research in all sub-fields of cultural anthropology. Because the National Science Foundation's mission is to support basic research, the NSF Cultural Anthropology Program does not fund research that takes as its primary goal improved clinical practice, humanistic understanding or applied policy. A proposal that applies anthropological methods to a social problem but does not propose how that problem provides an opportunity to make a theory-testing and/or theory-expanding contribution to anthropology will be returned without review.

Program research priorities include, but are not limited to, research that increases our understanding of:

- Sociocultural drivers of critical anthropogenic processes such as deforestation, desertification, land cover change, urbanization and poverty.
- Resilience and robustness of sociocultural systems.
- Scientific principles underlying conflict, cooperation and altruism, as well as explanations of variation in culture, norms, behaviors and institutions.
- Economy, culture, migration and globalization.
- Variability and change in kinship and family norms and practices.
- General cultural and social principles underlining the drivers of health outcomes and disease transmission.
- Biocultural work that considers the nexus of human culture and its relationship with human biology.
- Social regulation, governmentality and violence.
- Origins of complexity in sociocultural systems.
- Language and culture: orality and literacy, sociolinguistics and cognition.
- Theoretically-informed approaches to co-production in relation to scientific understandings of human variability and environmental stewardship.
- Mathematical and computational models of sociocultural systems such as social network analysis, agent-based models, multi-level models, and modes that integrate agent-based simulations and geographic information systems (GIS).
- Socio-cultural drivers of technology and technological systems such as AI, machine learning, augmented data, and platforms.

As part of its effort to encourage and support projects that explicitly integrate education and basic research, CA provides support to enhance and improve the conduct of doctoral dissertation projects designed and carried out by doctoral students enrolled in U.S. institutions of higher education who are conducting scientific research that enhances basic scientific knowledge.

Broadening Participation In STEM

NSF recognizes the unique lived experiences of individuals from communities that are underrepresented and/or underserved in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and the barriers to inclusion and access to STEM education and careers. NSF highly encourages the leadership, partnership, and contributions in all NSF opportunities of individuals who are members of such communities supported by NSF. This includes leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding; serving as peer reviewers, advisory committee members, and/or committee of

visitor members; and serving as NSF leadership, program, and/or administrative staff. NSF also highly encourages demographically diverse institutions of higher education (IHEs) to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities on behalf of their research and education communities. NSF expects that all individuals, including those who are members of groups that are underrepresented and/or under-served in STEM, are treated equitably and inclusively in the Foundation's proposal and award process.

NSF encourages IHEs that enroll, educate, graduate, and employ individuals who are members of groups underrepresented and/or under-served in STEM education programs and careers to lead, partner, and contribute to NSF opportunities, including leading and designing STEM research and education proposals for funding. Such IHEs include, but may not be limited to, community colleges and two-year institutions, mission-based institutions such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), women's colleges, and institutions that primarily serve persons with disabilities, as well as institutions defined by enrollment such as Predominantly Undergraduate Institutions (PUIs), Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs), and Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs).

"Broadening participation in STEM" is the comprehensive phrase used by NSF to refer to the Foundation's goal of increasing the representation and diversity of individuals, organizations, and geographic regions that contribute to STEM teaching, research, and innovation. To broaden participation in STEM, it is necessary to address issues of equity, inclusion, and access in STEM education, training, and careers. Whereas all NSF programs might support broadening participation components, some programs primarily focus on supporting broadening participation research and projects. Examples can be found on the NSF [Broadening Participation in STEM](#) website.

Cognizant Program Officer(s):

Please note that the following information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

- Jeffrey Mantz, Program Director, W13148, telephone: (703) 292-7783, email: jmantz@nsf.gov
- Tarini Bedi, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-8740, email: tbedi@nsf.gov
- Jeremy Koster, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-8740, email: jkoster@nsf.gov
- Brittney Cleveland, Program Specialist, telephone: (703) 292-4634, email: bclevela@nsf.gov

Applicable Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number(s):

- 47.075 --- Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences

Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award:Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 40 to 50

During a fiscal year, Cultural Anthropology expects to recommend (either on its own or jointly with one or more other NSF programs) a total of 40-50 doctoral dissertation research improvement (DDRIG) awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$800,000

Anticipated Funding Amount is \$800,000 pending availability of funds. Project budgets should be developed at scales appropriate for the work to be conducted. The total direct costs for CA DDRIG awards may not exceed \$25,000; applicable indirect costs are in addition to (that is, on top of) that amount.

The proposer may concurrently submit a doctoral dissertation proposal to other funding organizations. Please indicate this in the "Current and Pending (Other) Support" section of the NSF proposal, so that NSF may coordinate funding with the other organizations. The "Current and Pending (Other) Support" section of the NSF proposal should also list the submitted NSF proposal itself. The proposer may submit a DDRIG proposal to only one NSF program although they may

request that the proposal be co-reviewed with one or more other NSF programs; actual co-review will be at the discretion of the relevant program officers.

Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members. Special Instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of sub-awards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.
- Non-profit, non-academic organizations: Independent museums, observatories, research laboratories, professional societies and similar organizations located in the U.S. that are directly associated with educational or research activities.
- Tribal Nations: An American Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges as a federally recognized tribe pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, 25 U.S.C. §§ 5130-5131.

Who May Serve as PI:

The proposal must be submitted through regular organizational channels by the dissertation advisor(s) on behalf of the graduate student. The advisor is the principal investigator (PI); the student is the co-principal investigator (co-PI). The student must be the author of the proposal. The student must be enrolled at a U.S. institution, but need not be a U.S. citizen. To be eligible to serve as the PI, the advisor must be available during the period of submission, review, and performance of the research to relay information and communications from NSF to the student.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI:

There are no limitations on the number of DDRIGs that may be submitted by an organization on behalf of a single faculty member during a specific competition or over the course of their career. But an organization may submit only two proposals (an original submission and if necessary a resubmission) for a particular student over the student's career, barring special dispensation from the Cultural Anthropology Program for an additional resubmission. Such dispensations are exclusively at the discretion of the CA Program Officer(s).

A student and their advisor therefore should carefully consider at what point during the student's graduate program the student is ready to submit a DDRIG proposal, keeping in mind that proposal processing normally takes approximately six months.

Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

- **Letters of Intent:** Not required
- **Preliminary Proposal Submission:** Not required

- **Full Proposals:**

- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) guidelines apply. The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.
- Full Proposals submitted via Grants.gov: *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov* guidelines apply (Note: The *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide).

B. Budgetary Information

- **Cost Sharing Requirements:**

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

- **Indirect Cost (F&A) Limitations:**

Not Applicable

- **Other Budgetary Limitations:**

Not Applicable

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

January 15, 2025

January 15, Annually Thereafter

August 15, 2025

August 15, Annually Thereafter

Proposal Review Information Criteria

Merit Review Criteria:

National Science Board approved criteria apply.

Award Administration Information

Award Conditions:

Standard NSF award conditions apply.

Reporting Requirements:

Standard NSF reporting requirements apply.

I. Introduction

The Cultural Anthropology Program awards Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants (DDRIGs) in all areas of cultural anthropological science supported by the program. The primary objective of the Cultural Anthropology Program is to support basic scientific research on the causes, consequences and complexities of human social and cultural variability. DDRIGs support the development of the next generation of cultural anthropologists to pursue those questions.

Contemporary cultural anthropology is an arena in which diverse research traditions and methodologies are valid in investigations of human cultural variation. Recognizing the breadth of the field's contributions to science and its methodological variety, the Cultural Anthropology Program welcomes proposals for empirically grounded, theoretically engaged and methodologically sophisticated research in all sub-fields of cultural anthropology. Because the National Science Foundation's mission is to support basic research, the NSF Cultural Anthropology Program does not fund research that takes as its primary goal improved clinical practice, humanistic or philosophical understanding or applied policy. Program research priorities include, but are not limited to, research that increases our understanding of:

- Sociocultural drivers of critical anthropogenic processes such as deforestation, desertification, land cover change, urbanization and poverty.
- Resilience and robustness of sociocultural systems.
- Scientific principles underlying conflict, cooperation and altruism, as well as explanations of variation in culture, norms, behaviors and institutions.
- Economy, culture, migration and globalization.
- Variability and change in kinship and family norms and practices.
- General cultural and social principles underlining the drivers of health outcomes and disease transmission.
- Biocultural work that considers the nexus of human culture and its relationship with human biology.
- Social regulation, governmentality and violence.
- Origins of complexity in sociocultural systems.
- Language and culture: orality and literacy, sociolinguistics and cognition.
- Theoretically informed approaches to co-production in relation to scientific understandings of human variability and environmental stewardship.
- Mathematical and computational models of sociocultural systems such as social network analysis, agent-based models, multi-level models, and modes that integrate agent-based simulations and geographic information systems (GIS).
- Socio-cultural drivers of technology and technological systems such as AI, machine learning, augmented data, and platforms.

II. Program Description

CA Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grants provide funds for items not usually available from the student's U.S. academic institution. The awards are not intended to provide the full costs of a student's doctoral dissertation research or to replace support for a student's program of graduate study that is typically provided by the student's institution. Funds may be used for valid research expenses. The funds may not be used for post-field research writing, analysis and thesis production costs. Funds may not be used for stipends, tuition or the purchase of textbooks or journals. Further details concerning allowable as well as non-allowable expenses can be found in the budgetary information section of this solicitation.

While NSF provides support for doctoral dissertation research, the student (co-PI) is solely responsible for the conduct of such research and preparation of results for publication. NSF, therefore, does not assume responsibility for such findings or their interpretation. This program does not support research with applied, disease-related goals, including research directly focused on the etiology, diagnosis or treatment of disease or dysfunction.

III. Award Information

Anticipated Type of Award: Standard Grant

Estimated Number of Awards: 40 to 50

During a fiscal year, Cultural Anthropology expects to recommend (either on its own or jointly with one or more other NSF programs) a total of 40-50 doctoral dissertation research improvement (DDRIG) awards.

Anticipated Funding Amount: \$800,000

Anticipated Funding Amount is \$800,000 pending availability of funds. Project budgets should be developed at scales appropriate for the work to be conducted. The total direct costs for CA DDRIG awards may not exceed \$25,000; applicable indirect costs are in addition to (that is, on top of) that amount.

The proposer may concurrently submit a doctoral dissertation proposal to other funding organizations. Please indicate this in the "Current and Pending (Other) Support" section of the NSF proposal, so that NSF may coordinate funding with the other organizations. The "Current and Pending (Other) Support" section of the NSF proposal should also list the proposal itself. The proposer may submit a DDRIG proposal to only one NSF program although they may request that the proposal be co-reviewed with one or more other NSF programs; actual co-review will be at the discretion of the relevant program officers.

Estimated program budget, number of awards and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

IV. Eligibility Information

Who May Submit Proposals:

Proposals may only be submitted by the following:

- Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) - Two- and four-year IHEs (including community colleges) accredited in, and having a campus located in the US, acting on behalf of their faculty members. Special Instructions for International Branch Campuses of US IHEs: If the proposal includes funding to be provided to an international branch campus of a US institution of higher education (including through use of sub-awards and consultant arrangements), the proposer must explain the benefit(s) to the project of performance at the international branch campus, and justify why the project activities cannot be performed at the US campus.
- Non-profit, non-academic organizations: Independent museums, observatories, research laboratories, professional societies and similar organizations located in the U.S. that are directly associated with educational or research activities.
- Tribal Nations: An American Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges as a federally recognized tribe pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, 25 U.S.C. §§ 5130-5131.

Who May Serve as PI:

The proposal must be submitted through regular organizational channels by the dissertation advisor(s) on behalf of the graduate student. The advisor is the principal investigator (PI); the student is the co-principal investigator (co-PI). The student must be the author of the proposal. The student must be enrolled at a U.S. institution, but need not be a U.S. citizen. To be eligible to serve as the PI, the advisor must be available during the period of submission, review, and performance of the research to relay information and communications from NSF to the student.

Limit on Number of Proposals per Organization:

There are no restrictions or limits.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI:

There are no limitations on the number of DDRIGs that may be submitted by an organization on behalf of a single faculty member during a specific competition or over the course of their career. But an

organization may submit only two proposals (an original submission and if necessary a resubmission) for a particular student over the student's career, barring special dispensation from the Cultural Anthropology Program for an additional resubmission. Such dispensations are exclusively at the discretion of the CA Program Officer(s).

A student and their advisor therefore should carefully consider at what point during the student's graduate program the student is ready to submit a DDRIG proposal, keeping in mind that proposal processing normally takes approximately six months.

V. Proposal Preparation And Submission Instructions

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Full Proposal Preparation Instructions: Proposers may opt to submit proposals in response to this Program Solicitation via Research.gov or Grants.gov.

- Full Proposals submitted via Research.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the general guidelines contained in the *NSF Proposal and Award Policies and Procedures Guide* (PAPPG). The complete text of the PAPPG is available electronically on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg. Paper copies of the PAPPG may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov. The Prepare New Proposal setup will prompt you for the program solicitation number.
- Full proposals submitted via Grants.gov: Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation via Grants.gov should be prepared and submitted in accordance with the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide: A Guide for the Preparation and Submission of NSF Applications via Grants.gov*. The complete text of the *NSF Grants.gov Application Guide* is available on the Grants.gov website and on the NSF website at: (https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=grantsgovguide). To obtain copies of the Application Guide and Application Forms Package, click on the Apply tab on the Grants.gov site, then click on the Apply Step 1: Download a Grant Application Package and Application Instructions link and enter the funding opportunity number, (the program solicitation number without the NSF prefix) and press the Download Package button. Paper copies of the Grants.gov Application Guide also may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

See PAPPG Chapter II.C.2 for guidance on the required sections of a full research proposal submitted to NSF. Please note that the proposal preparation instructions provided in this program solicitation may deviate from the PAPPG instructions.

In addition to the guidelines in the PAPPG or NSF Grants.gov Application Guide, specific instructions for Cultural Anthropology (CA) Doctoral Dissertation Research Improvement Grant (DDRIG) proposals are:

Proposal Set-Up

Select "Prepare New Full Proposal" in Research.gov. Search for and select this solicitation title in Step 1 of the Full Proposal wizard. The information in Step 2, Where to Apply, will be pre-populated by the system. Select "Research" as the proposal type. In the proposal details section, select "Single proposal (with or without sub-awards). Separately submitted collaborative proposals will be returned without review. The project title must begin with "Doctoral Dissertation Research:". The title should be descriptive rather than clever. It should emphasize the generalizable science that the research will address, such as the main research question that the student aims to investigate.

You may select additional programs if you would like those programs to consider co-review of your proposal with Cultural Anthropology. After the proposal is created click on the "Manage Where to Apply" link on the proposal main page. This will open the "Manage Where to Apply" page where additional programs can be selected. Note that a request for co-review should be made only when the PIs believe the proposed work makes a strong case for advancing theory and basic knowledge in multiple communities served by multiple programs and when the project description engages literature from those communities. Methods that are relevant to other programs are not sufficient to merit co-review; the

contribution must be theoretical and scientific. Not all standing programs support the co-review of DDRIG proposals. You should verify that the proposed program is willing to co-review a DDRIG proposal.

Senior/Key Personnel

List the primary dissertation advisor as the "PI" and the student as the "co-PI."

Cover Sheet

- Mark human subjects as pending, approved or exempted.

Project Description

- This section is limited to 10 single-spaced pages of text.
- The "Results from Prior NSF Support" section is NOT required for DDRIG proposals.
- The project description must include:
 - A statement of the research problem and its scientific importance, specific aims, questions or hypotheses. The research questions or hypotheses must be empirically driven. Arguments that are not subject to falsification via empirical discovery and data analysis will be returned without review. Projects that are motivated strictly by philosophical or humanistic questions, or that source information in service of a particular theoretical position (without putting that theoretical position at risk of falsification through data collection and analysis), will also be judged to be unsuitable for funding and returned without review.
 - A section addressing intellectual merit (we recommend you clearly label it in a way that highlights the basic scientific value of the project, e.g., "intellectual merit," "scientific generalizability," or "scientific merit", rather than "literature review"). This section should describe the project's potential contribution to advancing anthropological theory beyond the site and context of the project itself. It should include a focused review of what is thought to be known about the topic of study and a clear statement of what the project's original contribution will be and why that contribution will be significant. Proposals that list areas of scholarship without reference to the specific means by which theory will be tested, queried or advanced are not sufficient. The project description must describe the project's potential contribution to advancing anthropological theory beyond the site and context of the project itself. Projects that are focused narrowly on the sociological or cultural context of a particular site that fail to frame the project in terms of a larger, generalizable set of questions will be returned without review.
 - A section labeled broader impacts that discusses the broader impacts of the proposed activities and the pathways by which those broader impacts will be realized. **Broader impacts** are significant effects beyond basic science. They might include communicating results to policy makers, contributing to the knowledge base to solve an important social problem, engaging students of any age in the research enterprise, doing outreach to the public, producing databases that contribute to scientific infrastructure, strengthening international research collaborations, broadening the scientific participation of underrepresented communities, or strengthening research capacity in developing nations. Partisan activities explicitly related to advocacy and/or activism fall outside of the statutory mission of the NSF and should not be included.
 - A discussion of any preliminary studies performed by the student, the results of those studies and how they inform the project.
 - An account of whether the student has the relevant technical training, language competence and other preparation necessary to make the project feasible. This must also include an explanation of how the student has obtained the relevant methodological training (at their institution or elsewhere) to conduct a scientific research project.
 - A statement of steps taken to ensure objectivity given student positionality with respect to their research site(s), question(s) and hypotheses;

- A research design that includes a discussion of the research site(s) and source(s) of data, the methods by which data will be collected to answer the questions or test hypotheses posed by the proposal, and the reasons those methods are the most appropriate.
- A clear description of the systematic strategy that will be used to recruit research participants (i.e., sample design) and a justified estimate of the sample size necessary to achieve research objectives. Research sample design and estimates of sample size should be carefully described; the researcher should explain how these strategies mitigate sampling bias, omitted variables and confirmation biases.
- A well-developed data analysis plan (usually one page in length) that explains how the data will be systematically analyzed to address the specific research questions, aims or hypotheses posed within the proposal.
- A research schedule or timeline that includes the date that funds are required.

Budget and Budget Justification

- The budget justification pages should be used to detail and explain the rationale for each item requested.
- Travel expenses may include food and lodging as well as transportation while the researcher is living away from their normal place of residence. All travel expenses should be requested under "Travel - Domestic" or "Travel - Foreign."
- All other expenses should be requested under "Other Direct Costs."
- No items may be budgeted under "Consultants" or "Sub-awards". If casual or itinerant labor is being requested to assist in data collection activities (e.g., the hiring of local field assistants at a research site), this may be budgeted under "Other Direct Costs."
- Incentive payments to research participants to participate in the study should be budgeted under "Other Direct Costs." These should not be described as "gifts."
- Any software requested should be at academic pricing where available.
- Salaries or stipends for the graduate student or the advisor are not eligible for support. Therefore, after the PI and co-PI(s) are entered on the cover page, their names must be manually removed from the Senior/Key Personnel listing on the budget pages. This is to avoid construal as voluntary committed cost sharing, which is not permitted.


Facilities, Equipment & Other Resources


- If you have resources (such as a research awards from another sources) that will be used to supplement any NSF award, those resources must be listed here (rather than in the budget justification).

Data Management and Sharing Plan

A data management and sharing plan is required for all research proposals, and proposals that do not include one will not be able to be submitted. The plan should address the following questions:

- What kinds of data, software and other materials will your research produce?
- How will you manage them (e.g., standards for meta-data, format, organization, etc.)?
- How will you give other researchers access to your data, while preserving confidentiality, security, intellectual property and other rights and requirements?
- How will you archive data and preserve access in publicly accessible and institutionally maintained repositories in the short and the long term? (A departmental website is *not* dequate.)

PIs are encouraged to consult the [American Anthropological Association's \(AAA\) Statement on Professional Ethics](#) . PIs who plan to use a standard archive, such as the Qualitative Data Repository (QDR) at Syracuse University, the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) archive housed at the University of Michigan or the Harvard University Data-verse, are strongly advised to contact the archive before undertaking the research to ascertain any specific requirements for permissions or meta-data, which would require advance planning. The [AAA maintains a](#)

[wiki](#)  where researchers can identify where their data are archived or deposited. We recommend use of this facility to enhance data sharing.

Individuals with disabilities who need reasonable accommodations as part of the proposal process must contact the NSF Office of Equity and Civil Rights (OECR) at least 30 days prior to the proposal target date.

Supplementary Documentation

- Up to two pages of technical illustrations, maps, or sample survey questions may be included as a supplementary document.
- If the project's success depends on access to a non-public site (such as a clinic, Native American or Indigenous territory or business), PIs are advised to obtain a letter providing that access. This should not be an endorsement of the proposal. Please use this template:

To: NSF _____(Program Title)_____ Program

From: _____

(Printed name of the individual collaborator or name of the organization and name and position of the official submitting this memo)

By signing below (or transmitting electronically), we acknowledge that we are listed as providing resources, access or assistance for the project described in the proposal entitled. Barring unforeseen events, I/we agree to provide the access, resources or assistance as described in the project description of the proposal.

Signed: _____

Organization: _____

Date: _____

Letters of reference or evaluation are NOT allowed. The Cultural Anthropology Program does NOT require a letter from the department assessing the student's progress to degree.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

Proposers may request up to \$25,000 in direct costs and durations of up to 24 months. There are no indirect cost limitations; proposals submitted in response to this solicitation are subject to the awardee's current federally negotiated indirect cost rate. Indirect costs are in addition to (that is, on top of) the maximum direct cost request of up to \$25,000. Project budgets should be developed at scales appropriate for the work to be conducted and may only include costs directly associated with the conduct of dissertation research. Please allow 6 to 8 months after the target date for an award to be made.

DDRIG awards provide funding for research costs not normally covered by the student's university. Expenses that may be included in a DDRIG proposal budget include:

- Costs associated with travel and related expenses (budgeted under Line E) to conduct research at field sites, archives, specialized collections or facilities away from the student's campus.
- Costs for data collection activities.
- Costs for modest field equipment (e.g., laptops; photo, video or audio equipment), and materials and supplies (usually budgeted under Line G1) necessary for the conduct of the project that will be devoted to the project over the duration of the award. (Note that any equipment purchased with NSF funds becomes property of the awardee)

organization.) Costs should be based on appropriateness to the scientific need of the study and current market prices. Top-of-the-line equipment is generally not funded unless there is a specific and well-justified explanation as to why standard equipment will not suffice.

- Costs of providing participant incentives (budgeted under Line G6) as needed to assure participation in the research or compensation for having participated. Please note that gifts are usually not allowed. For example:
 - NOT ALLOWABLE: donation of books to a needy school or gifts simply because it is cultural custom.
 - ALLOWABLE: purchase of books needed to perform a study that will take place at a school, incentives (including pre-paid gift cards) for participation in a study that would likely not be able to be completed without incentives (e.g., a very long survey to fill out, a study that requires multiple follow-up sessions, medical testing, etc.), subject payments for survey respondents.
- Costs for casual or itinerant research assistance (budgeted under Line G6), such as the hiring of local field assistants at a research site, if essential to the execution of the study. Specifically address the significance of this local support to the successful execution of the project in the budget justification.
- Costs for other research services that are essential for the research and are not otherwise available.
- Costs for travel-specific insurance (such as for medical evacuation and repatriation of remains), if appropriately justified.
- Costs for modest (i.e., typically less than State Department or GAO per diem rates) living expenses for the co-PI during research in locations away from the university or normal place of residence.
- For field data collection efforts that are being carried out locally (i.e., within 50 miles of the researcher's home institution), costs for a per diem or stipend to support living costs if the research is being conducted full time. Those costs should be budgeted under Line G6.
- Costs of obtaining a visa required for the research.
- Costs related to achieving the broader impacts of the proposed work.
- Costs for the travel expenses of relatives or dependents, including childcare, may be allowable as specifically authorized and described in 2 CFR § 200.475. We recommend contacting program officers in advance of proposal submission, wherever possible, to discuss allowability of specific costs.

Costs that cannot be reimbursed by DDRIG awards include the following:

- Salary for the doctoral student or advisor.
- Costs for tuition, university fees, the purchase of textbooks or journals (except publication costs), dissertation preparation, routine medical insurance, mortgage payments, personal clothing, toiletries, over-the-counter medicines or other items not directly related to the conduct of dissertation research.
- Costs for transcription services are not ordinarily allowed.
- Costs for consultants budgeted under Line G3.
- Subawards budgeted under Line G5 Costs for expensive cameras and computers unless justified in terms of the research goals.
- Insurance for equipment.
- "Gifts" or "tokens" for research participants/informants that are requested because it is a cultural norm to exchange gifts.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitting organization's local time):

January 15, 2025

January 15, Annually Thereafter

August 15, 2025

August 15, Annually Thereafter

D. Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements

For Proposals Submitted Via Research.gov:

To prepare and submit a proposal via Research.gov, see detailed technical instructions available at: https://www.research.gov/research-portal/appmanager/base/desktop?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=research_node_display&_nodePath=/researchGov/Service/Desktop/ProposalPreparationona
For Research.gov user support, call the Research.gov Help Desk at 1-800-381-1532 or e-mail rgov@nsf.gov. The Research.gov Help Desk answers general technical questions related to the use of the Research.gov system. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this funding opportunity.

For Proposals Submitted Via Grants.gov:

Before using Grants.gov for the first time, each organization must register to create an institutional profile. Once registered, the applicant's organization can then apply for any federal grant on the Grants.gov website. Comprehensive information about using Grants.gov is available on the Grants.gov Applicant Resources webpage: <https://www.grants.gov/applicants>. In addition, the NSF Grants.gov Application Guide (see link in Section V.A) provides instructions regarding the technical preparation of proposals via Grants.gov. For Grants.gov user support, contact the Grants.gov Contact Center at 1-800-518-4726 or by email: support@grants.gov. The Grants.gov Contact Center answers general technical questions related to the use of Grants.gov. Specific questions related to this program solicitation should be referred to the NSF program staff contact(s) listed in Section VIII of this solicitation.

Submitting the Proposal: Once all documents have been completed, the Authorized Organizational Representative (AOR) must submit the application to Grants.gov and verify the desired funding opportunity and agency to which the application is submitted. The AOR must then sign and submit the application to Grants.gov. The completed application will be transferred to Research.gov for further processing.

The NSF [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov informational page](#) provides submission guidance to applicants and links to helpful resources including the NSF [Grants.gov Application Guide](#), [Grants.gov Proposal Processing in Research.gov how-to guide](#), and [Grants.gov Submitted Proposals Frequently Asked Questions](#). Grants.gov proposals must pass all NSF pre-check and post-check validations in order to be accepted by Research.gov at NSF.

When submitting via Grants.gov, NSF strongly recommends applicants initiate proposal submission at least five business days in advance of a deadline to allow adequate time to address NSF compliance errors and resubmissions by 5:00 p.m. submitting organization's local time on the deadline. Please note that some errors cannot be corrected in Grants.gov. Once a proposal passes pre-checks but fails any post-check, an applicant can only correct and submit the in-progress proposal in Research.gov.

Proposers that submitted via Research.gov may use Research.gov to verify the status of their submission to NSF. For proposers that submitted via Grants.gov, until an application has been received and validated by NSF, the Authorized Organizational Representative may check the status of an application on Grants.gov. After proposers have received an e-mail notification from NSF, Research.gov should be used to check the status of an application.

VI. NSF Proposal Processing And Review Procedures

Proposals received by NSF are assigned to the appropriate NSF program for acknowledgment and, if they meet NSF requirements, for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an NSF

Program Officer, and usually by three to ten other persons outside NSF either as *ad hoc* reviewers, panelists, or both, who are experts in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by Program Officers charged with oversight of the review process. Proposers are invited to suggest names of persons they believe are especially well qualified to review the proposal and/or persons they would prefer not review the proposal. These suggestions may serve as one source in the reviewer selection process at the Program Officer's discretion. Submission of such names, however, is optional. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition, Program Officers may obtain comments from site visits before recommending final action on proposals. Senior NSF staff further review recommendations for awards. A flowchart that depicts the entire NSF proposal and award process (and associated timeline) is included in PAPPG Exhibit III-1.

A comprehensive description of the Foundation's merit review process is available on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/.

Proposers should also be aware of core strategies that are essential to the fulfillment of NSF's mission, as articulated in [Leading the World in Discovery and Innovation, STEM Talent Development and the Delivery of Benefits from Research - NSF Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years \(FY\) 2022 - 2026](#). These strategies are integrated in the program planning and implementation process, of which proposal review is one part. NSF's mission is particularly well-implemented through the integration of research and education and broadening participation in NSF programs, projects, and activities.

One of the strategic objectives in support of NSF's mission is to foster integration of research and education through the programs, projects, and activities it supports at academic and research institutions. These institutions must recruit, train, and prepare a diverse STEM workforce to advance the frontiers of science and participate in the U.S. technology-based economy. NSF's contribution to the national innovation ecosystem is to provide cutting-edge research under the guidance of the Nation's most creative scientists and engineers. NSF also supports development of a strong science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce by investing in building the knowledge that informs improvements in STEM teaching and learning.

NSF's mission calls for the broadening of opportunities and expanding participation of groups, institutions, and geographic regions that are underrepresented in STEM disciplines, which is essential to the health and vitality of science and engineering. NSF is committed to this principle of diversity and deems it central to the programs, projects, and activities it considers and supports.

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

The National Science Foundation strives to invest in a robust and diverse portfolio of projects that creates new knowledge and enables breakthroughs in understanding across all areas of science and engineering research and education. To identify which projects to support, NSF relies on a merit review process that incorporates consideration of both the technical aspects of a proposed project and its potential to contribute more broadly to advancing NSF's mission "to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes." NSF makes every effort to conduct a fair, competitive, transparent merit review process for the selection of projects.

1. Merit Review Principles

These principles are to be given due diligence by PIs and organizations when preparing proposals and managing projects, by reviewers when reading and evaluating proposals, and by NSF program staff when determining whether or not to recommend proposals for funding and while overseeing awards. Given that NSF is the primary federal agency charged with nurturing and supporting excellence in basic research and education, the following three principles apply:

- All NSF projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- NSF projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals. These "Broader Impacts" may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project

activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified.

- Meaningful assessment and evaluation of NSF funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects. If the size of the activity is limited, evaluation of that activity in isolation is not likely to be meaningful. Thus, assessing the effectiveness of these activities may best be done at a higher, more aggregated, level than the individual project.

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of those activities.

These three merit review principles provide the basis for the merit review criteria, as well as a context within which the users of the criteria can better understand their intent.

2. Merit Review Criteria

All NSF proposals are evaluated through use of the two National Science Board approved merit review criteria. In some instances, however, NSF will employ additional criteria as required to highlight the specific objectives of certain programs and activities.

The two merit review criteria are listed below. **Both** criteria are to be given **full consideration** during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria. (PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.d(i). contains additional information for use by proposers in development of the Project Description section of the proposal). Reviewers are strongly encouraged to review the criteria, including PAPPG Chapter II.D.2.d(i), prior to the review of a proposal.

When evaluating NSF proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit:** The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and
- **Broader Impacts:** The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
 - a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
 - b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. NSF values

the advancement of scientific knowledge and activities that contribute to achievement of societally relevant outcomes. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); improved STEM education and educator development at any level; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive STEM workforce; increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others; improved national security; increased economic competitiveness of the United States; and enhanced infrastructure for research and education.

Proposers are reminded that reviewers will also be asked to review the Data Management and Sharing Plan and the Mentoring Plan, as appropriate.

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by Panel Review.

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two National Science Board approved merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Program Officer assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation.

After scientific, technical and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the cognizant Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. NSF strives to be able to tell proposers whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months. Large or particularly complex proposals or proposals from new recipients may require additional review and processing time. The time interval begins on the deadline or target date, or receipt date, whichever is later. The interval ends when the Division Director acts upon the Program Officer's recommendation.

After programmatic approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding will be forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements or the Division of Acquisition and Cooperative Support for review of business, financial, and policy implications. After an administrative review has occurred, Grants and Agreements Officers perform the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. Proposers are cautioned that only a Grants and Agreements Officer may make commitments, obligations or awards on behalf of NSF or authorize the expenditure of funds. No commitment on the part of NSF should be inferred from technical or budgetary discussions with a NSF Program Officer. A Principal Investigator or organization that makes financial or personnel commitments in the absence of a grant or cooperative agreement signed by the NSF Grants and Agreements Officer does so at their own risk.

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Program Officer. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

VII. Award Administration Information

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to *the submitting organization* by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer. Organizations whose proposals are declined will be advised as promptly as possible by the cognizant NSF Program administering the program. Verbatim copies of reviews, not including the identity of the reviewer, will be provided automatically to the Principal Investigator. (See Section VI.B. for additional information on the review process.)

B. Award Conditions

An NSF award consists of: (1) the award notice, which includes any special provisions applicable to the award and any numbered amendments thereto; (2) the budget, which indicates the amounts, by categories of expense, on which NSF has based its support (or otherwise communicates any specific approvals or disapprovals of proposed expenditures); (3)

the proposal referenced in the award notice; (4) the applicable award conditions, such as Grant General Conditions (GC-1)*; or Research Terms and Conditions* and (5) any announcement or other NSF issuance that may be incorporated by reference in the award notice. Cooperative agreements also are administered in accordance with NSF Cooperative Agreement Financial and Administrative Terms and Conditions (CA-FATC) and the applicable Programmatic Terms and Conditions. NSF awards are electronically signed by an NSF Grants and Agreements Officer and transmitted electronically to the organization via e-mail.

*These documents may be accessed electronically on NSF's Website at https://www.nsf.gov/awards/managing/award_conditions.jsp?org=NSF. Paper copies may be obtained from the NSF Publications Clearinghouse, telephone (703) 292-8134 or by e-mail from nsfpubs@nsf.gov.

More comprehensive information on NSF Award Conditions and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

Administrative and National Policy Requirements

Build America, Buy America

As expressed in Executive Order 14005, [Ensuring the Future is Made in All of America by All of America's Workers](#) (86 FR 7475), it is the policy of the executive branch to use terms and conditions of Federal financial assistance awards to maximize, consistent with law, the use of goods, products, and materials produced in, and services offered in, the United States.

Consistent with the requirements of the Build America, Buy America Act (Pub. L. 117-58, Division G, Title IX, Subtitle A, November 15, 2021), no funding made available through this funding opportunity may be obligated for infrastructure projects under an award unless all iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in the project are produced in the United States. For additional information, visit NSF's [Build America, Buy America](#) web page.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all multi-year grants (including both standard and continuing grants), the Principal Investigator must submit an annual project report to the cognizant Program Officer no later than 90 days prior to the end of the current budget period. (Some programs or awards require submission of more frequent project reports). No later than 120 days following expiration of a grant, the PI also is required to submit a final annual project report, and a project outcomes report for the general public.

Failure to provide the required annual or final annual project reports, or the project outcomes report, will delay NSF review and processing of any future funding increments as well as any pending proposals for all identified PIs and co-PIs on a given award. PIs should examine the formats of the required reports in advance to assure availability of required data.

PIs are required to use NSF's electronic project-reporting system, available through [Research.gov](#), for preparation and submission of annual and final annual project reports. Such reports provide information on accomplishments, project participants (individual and organizational), publications, and other specific products and impacts of the project. Submission of the report via [Research.gov](#) constitutes certification by the PI that the contents of the report are accurate and complete. The project outcomes report also must be prepared and submitted using [Research.gov](#). This report serves as a brief summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project. This report will be posted on the NSF website exactly as it is submitted by the PI.

More comprehensive information on NSF Reporting Requirements and other important information on the administration of NSF awards is contained in the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* (PAPPG) Chapter VII, available electronically on the NSF Website at https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=pappg.

VIII. Agency Contacts

Please note that the program contact information is current at the time of publishing. See program website for any updates to the points of contact.

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:

- Jeffrey Mantz, Program Director, W13148, telephone: (703) 292-7783, email: jmantz@nsf.gov
- Tarini Bedi, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-8740, email: tbedi@nsf.gov
- Jeremy Koster, Program Director, telephone: (703) 292-8740, email: jkoster@nsf.gov
- Brittiney Cleveland, Program Specialist, telephone: (703) 292-4634, email: bclevela@nsf.gov

For questions related to the use of NSF systems contact:

- NSF Help Desk: 1-800-381-1532
- Research.gov Help Desk e-mail: rgov@nsf.gov

For questions relating to Grants.gov contact:

- Grants.gov Contact Center: If the Authorized Organizational Representatives (AOR) has not received a confirmation message from Grants.gov within 48 hours of submission of application, please contact via telephone: 1-800-518-4726; e-mail: support@grants.gov.

IX. Other Information

The NSF website provides the most comprehensive source of information on NSF Directorates (including contact information), programs and funding opportunities. Use of this website by potential proposers is strongly encouraged. In addition, "NSF Update" is an information-delivery system designed to keep potential proposers and other interested parties apprised of new NSF funding opportunities and publications, important changes in proposal and award policies and procedures, and upcoming NSF [Grants Conferences](#). Subscribers are informed through e-mail or the user's Web browser each time new publications are issued that match their identified interests. "NSF Update" also is available on [NSF's website](#).

Grants.gov provides an additional electronic capability to search for Federal government-wide grant opportunities. NSF funding opportunities may be accessed via this mechanism. Further information on Grants.gov may be obtained at <https://www.grants.gov>.

About The National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation (NSF) is an independent Federal agency created by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 USC 1861-75). The Act states the purpose of the NSF is "to promote the progress of science; [and] to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare by supporting research and education in all fields of science and engineering."

NSF funds research and education in most fields of science and engineering. It does this through grants and cooperative agreements to more than 2,000 colleges, universities, K-12 school systems, businesses, informal science organizations and other research organizations throughout the US. The Foundation accounts for about one-fourth of Federal support to academic institutions for basic research.

NSF receives approximately 55,000 proposals each year for research, education and training projects, of which approximately 11,000 are funded. In addition, the Foundation receives several thousand applications for graduate and postdoctoral fellowships. The agency operates no laboratories itself but does support National Research Centers, user facilities, certain oceanographic vessels and Arctic and Antarctic research stations. The Foundation also supports cooperative research between universities and industry, US participation in international scientific and engineering efforts, and educational activities at every academic level.

Facilitation Awards for Scientists and Engineers with Disabilities (FASED) provide funding for special assistance or equipment to enable persons with disabilities to work on NSF-supported projects. See the *NSF Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide* Chapter II.F.7 for instructions regarding preparation of these types of proposals.

The National Science Foundation has Telephonic Device for the Deaf (TDD) and Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) capabilities that enable individuals with hearing impairments to communicate with the Foundation about NSF programs, employment or general information. TDD may be accessed at (703) 292-5090 and (800) 281-8749, FIRS at (800) 877-8339.

The National Science Foundation Information Center may be reached at (703) 292-5111.

The National Science Foundation promotes and advances scientific progress in the United States by competitively awarding grants and cooperative agreements for research and education in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

To get the latest information about program deadlines, to download copies of NSF publications, and to access abstracts of awards, visit the NSF Website at <https://www.nsf.gov>.

- **Location:** 2415 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22314
- **For General Information** (NSF Information Center): (703) 292-5111
- **TDD (for the hearing-impaired):** (703) 292-5090
- **To Order Publications or Forms:**
 - Send an e-mail to: nsfpubs@nsf.gov
 - or telephone: (703) 292-8134
- **To Locate NSF Employees:** (703) 292-5111

Privacy Act And Public Burden Statements

The information requested on proposal forms and project reports is solicited under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by proposers will be used for program evaluation and reporting within the Executive Branch and to Congress. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer institutions/grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to government contractors, experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work; to other government agencies or other entities needing information regarding proposers or nominees as part of a joint application review process, or in order to coordinate programs or policy; and to another Federal agency, court, or party in a court or Federal administrative proceeding if the government is a party. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members. See [System of Record Notices, NSF-50](#), "Principal Investigator/Proposal File and Associated Records," and [NSF-51](#), "Reviewer/Proposal File and Associated Records." Submission of the information is voluntary. Failure to provide full and complete information, however, may reduce the possibility of receiving an award.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, an information collection unless it displays a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0058. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 120 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding the burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to:

Suzanne H. Plimpton
Reports Clearance Officer
Policy Office, Division of Institution and Award Support
Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management
National Science Foundation
Alexandria, VA 22314

[Vulnerability disclosure](#) | [Inspector General](#) | [Privacy](#) | [FOIA](#) | [No FEAR Act](#) | [USA.gov](#) | [Accessibility](#) |
[Plain language](#) |



National Science Foundation, 2415 Eisenhower Ave Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel: [\(703\) 292-5111](tel:7032925111),