

Narratives and Evaluation: How to Write Competitive NSF CS Education Proposals

Stephanie E. August, *National Science Foundation*
S. Megan Che, *Department of Teaching and Learning,
Clemson University*

Eileen T. Kraemer, *School of Computing, Clemson
University*

Mark Pauley, *National Science Foundation*

Murali Sitaraman, *School of Computing, Clemson
University*

Contact: august@nsf.gov

You develop a plan for testing the prototype for a new learning strategy in your class or across institutions. How can you ensure that your plan is clearly understood by reviewers and the managing NSF program officer? What goes through the reviewer's mind once a proposal is submitted? What prompts one proposal to be recommended for funding but another declined? Close examination of the panel review process can inform proposal writing and ensure that reviewers will understand an idea, identify its merit, and value a PI's vision of how the work will broaden participation in STEM education. This workshop steps through the NSF proposal review process from submission of proposal to award or decline, touching on NSF intellectual merit and broader impact criteria, mapping the project pipeline to appropriate evaluation. Participants gain insight into writing a good review and improving one's own proposal writing.

For further information see:
<https://people.cs.clemson.edu/~etkraem/UPCSEd/>. Laptops recommended.

Keywords: CS Education; Ed research proposals; Illustrative projects

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/--to-be-added> (you will receive this unique url string of where your abstract submission will eventually appear in the ACM DL, when you complete the ACM rightsreview form).

CCS Concepts: Authors, this ACM Classification section will be collected on the Sheridan submission page. You do **NOT** have to include these here. The submission page will lead you to:
http://dl.acm.org/ccs_flat.cfm