

**NSF Cyberlearning & Future Learning Technologies Solicitation Information Webinar for INTs
Monday, June 2nd 2014**

Q&A with NSF Program Officers

Is it true that you cannot apply for an INT without having had (the equivalent of) 2 prior NSF Cyberlearning grants as background to the INT. Would NSF ROLE and ALT projects count for the 2 prior Cyberlearning proposals required for an INT?

The **equivalent** of two prior DIP proposals is required. For example, you might have had something funded by the McArthur Foundation to design some new technology and to learn more about learning. You might have had things funded by the REAL program at NSF or the DRK-12 program or by AISL or by undergraduate education. The idea is that you have to have done the equivalent of two DIP projects. And DIP projects are about development of technology to a point where you've got a model and you've used it well enough that you really understand the genre that that technology represents.

Would effort from University-funded (intramural funding) effort count toward the requirement of "Work equivalent to two or more Cyberlearning DIP projects should be completed prior to applying for an INT" in the solicitation?

We don't care where the funding comes from. But, understand that DIPs are projects that are carried out over a three or four year time period. So, you need to get to the depth of what somebody would get to in a three to four year interdisciplinary project that they're working on.

In terms of the required two previous DIP funded projects necessary for [INT] application eligibility, does DIP type funding to the institution count (not necessarily to the INT PI applicant)?

So maybe the funding did not go to the PI – maybe it did not even go to the institution? I can imagine, for example, there's a lot of work on Scratch out there. It would not be crazy for somebody to be putting in a proposal that builds on all the research that's been done on Scratch and takes it farther. In the case of the [Mitch] Resnick proposal, it's the people who created Scratch who are putting in this – or it's the team that created Scratch who are putting in the proposal. But I can imagine others who have worked on Scratch or know enough about it, who could be putting something in around that. I could imagine the same for intelligent tutoring systems since many people who have worked on that.

How closely must INT proposal be related to the LOI?

It doesn't have to be that close.

**NSF Cyberlearning & Future Learning Technologies Solicitation Information Webinar for INTs
Monday, June 2nd 2014
Q&A with NSF Program Officers**

Please clarify the acronym DBR.

The acronym DBR is Design-Based Research. It's a way of doing research so that designs get better over time, and theory is addressed also during iterative work.

How broadly/narrowly is DBR being used here? For example, are quantitative or empirical approaches to DBR, such as A/B testing or Cognitive Task Analysis [appropriate]?

These are just fine. The idea is that you have to have multiple iterations; you should be doing your design and your research in conjunction with each other. Don't wait and do your research at the end.

Are platforms that address developer/instructors within scope?

Yes, they're within scope, to the extent that they actually focus on promoting learning and not simply on instructors giving a lecture or developers building some software.

As I heard it, the DBR aspects of the proposal should be included in the innovation section of the proposal, however the education research section will be its own section, correct? Do you then see these two activities as separate?

No, I do not see the activities as separate, but we are asking you to write about them separately, so that your reviewers will be able to make sense of it. So the way we were envisioning is that your innovation section will talk about the way that you're going to be trying out the technology and collecting the data that will help you to refine the innovation. Your research advancing learning section may, for some of you, be quite short. For example, it might say, "Here are the research questions we're going to answer," and then when you talk about how you're going to answer those questions, you might say, "We're going to use that same data that we're collecting to understand what learners are learning and not learning as we're trying to figure out how to do our refinement. But you might say that "we'll be analyzing that data in this other way as well", or "the analysis we do will fit both purposes". So, make clear the way that both kinds of research are integrated with what you're doing as you're doing your iterations. And we do suggest that you do set up your proposal with these three separate sections so it will be easy to find everything that the reviewers are looking for.

**NSF Cyberlearning & Future Learning Technologies Solicitation Information Webinar for INTs
Monday, June 2nd 2014
Q&A with NSF Program Officers**

Is depth in a single content area and grade level preferred over breadth in demonstrating a new platform/method genre across multiple content areas and/or grade levels (e.g., to help instructor/developers better bring good learning science to bear)?

Probably – if you’re doing something that you want to be general purpose, then you probably have enough depth to know that you’re complete, and enough breadth to know that it can go beyond the particular people and the particular discipline you’re actually aiming for. I’m not sure if I can answer that any better.