PREDOCTORAL INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM IN THE EDUCATION SCIENCES

CFDA NUMBER: 84.305

RELEASE DATE: February 4, 2004

REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS: NCER-04-06

Institute of Education Sciences

http://www.ed.gov/programs/edresearch/applicant.html

LETTER OF INTENT RECEIPT DATE: March 11, 2004

APPLICATION RECEIPT DATE: May 27, 2004

THIS REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS CONTAINS THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

1. Request for Applications
2. Purpose of the Training Program
3. Background
4. Requirements of the Proposed Training Program
5. Applications Available
6. Mechanism of Support
7. Funding Available
8. Eligible Applicants
9. Special Requirements
10. Letter of Intent
11. Submitting an Application
12. Contents and Page Limits of Application
13. Application Processing
14. Peer Review Process
15. Review Criteria
16. Receipt and Review Schedule
17. Award Decisions
18. Where to Send Inquiries
19. Program Authority
20. Applicable Regulations
21. References

1. REQUEST FOR APPLICATIONS

The Institute of Education Sciences (Institute) invites applications for its Predoctoral Interdisciplinary Research Training Program in the Education Sciences. For this competition, the Institute will consider only applications that meet the requirements outlined below under the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Program.

2. PURPOSE OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

The Institute's objectives in creating the Predoctoral Interdisciplinary Research Training Program in the Education Sciences are to support the development of innovative interdisciplinary training programs for doctoral students interested in conducting applied education research, and to establish a network of training programs that collectively produce a cadre of education researchers willing and able to conduct a new generation of methodologically rigorous and educationally relevant scientific research that will provide solutions to pressing problems and challenges facing American education.

3. BACKGROUND

A number of recent reports have described current education practice as not resting on a solid research base (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2002; NRC, 1999, NRC, 2000, NRC, 2002). Instead, policy decisions are often guided by personal experience, folk wisdom, and ideology. The passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 signals that the education enterprise of the United States has entered a new era in which policy and practice are expected to be based on evidence. This will require a transformation in the field of education. Practitioners will have to turn routinely to education research when making important decisions, and education researchers will have to produce research that is relevant to those decisions. To achieve this ambitious agenda, there is a need for a cadre of well-trained scientists capable of conducting high quality research that is relevant to practitioners and policy makers.

There are significant capacity issues within the education research community. According to a recent survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, only 7% of doctorate recipients in the field of Education cite research and development as their primary postdoctoral activity (Hoffer et.al., 2003). Similarly, a recent membership survey conducted by the American Educational Research Association (AERA) revealed that less than a quarter of its membership cite research as being their major responsibility (AERA, 2002). Perhaps even more worrisome is the fact that the number of Education doctorate recipients in the subfields of Education Statistics/Research Methods and Educational Assessment, Testing and Measures is extremely low compared to other subfields. This imbalance has remained consistent over the course of the past ten years (Hoffer, et.al., 2003; APA Research Office, in press). The situation is no better in closely-related disciplines. For instance, the number of doctoral degrees in educational psychology has declined from 144 in 1978 to 48 in 2001 (Hoffer et al., 2003). Compounding this decline is the fact that of the 48 doctoral degree recipients in 2001, only 16 reported being involved in research within one year of the receipt of their degree (APA Research Office, in press). Transforming education into an evidence-based field is very important work for the nation. It will require training new researchers in sufficient numbers to address the many tasks at hand.

There are also significant issues pertaining to the nature of the training that is currently being provided by graduate programs (Viadero, 2004). Many schools of education are not providing rigorous research training for doctoral students. While research training that is relevant to education is often provided elsewhere in universities, e.g., psychology and economics departments, these disciplines are seldom focused on education topics, and students are pointed towards other careers and research interests. Moreover, there seems to be a mismatch between what education decision makers want from the education research community and what the

education research community is providing. Educational practitioners want research to help them make informed decisions in those areas in which they have choices to make, such as curriculum and teacher professional development. They want the research and development enterprise to generate valid and useable assessment instruments. They want information on the relative costs and benefits of different education investments. They want effective management strategies to be developed and validated.

Many of the questions raised by practitioners and policy makers require answers to questions of what works in education for whom under what circumstances. These are causal questions that are best answered by randomized trials of interventions and approaches brought to scale. Yet, these are questions and methods with which relatively few in the education research community have been engaged. While the total number of articles featuring randomized field trials in other areas of social science research has steadily grown over the past 30 years, the number of randomized trials in education has lagged far behind (Boruch, de Moya & Snyder, 2001; Cook, 2001). A recent survey of every empirical article published in the American Educational Research Association's two premier journals over a ten-year span from 1993 to 2002 revealed that only 6% of the research reports utilized a randomized trial. In contrast, over six times as many studies used qualitative methods as the primary research tool (Whitehurst, 2003). Qualitative methods have a valid use in education research, but it is not to answer questions of what works. The dominance of qualitative methods in research reports in leading education research journals and the dominance of what works questions among practitioners is a clear sign of the mismatch between the focus of the practice community and the current research community.

Another category of questions raised by the practice community focuses on assessment. The standards and accountability movement has generated a ballooning demand for people who are trained in the design, implementation, analysis, and use of education tests and measures to assess the results of instruction, to aid in the selection and promotion of staff, and to support the management of schools and districts. Individuals with skills in psychometrics are needed throughout the education sector, from federal statistical agencies to university training programs to state education agencies to test developers, to local school districts. However, no more than 15 Psychology doctoral degrees in psychometrics have been awarded in a given year since 1992, and a ten year low of 2 were awarded in 2001 (APA Research Office, in press). Supply is meager.

Yet another category of problems raised by practitioners and policy makers is the need for a new generation of teaching materials and curricula that take advantage of expanding knowledge of how people learn and that leverage new delivery mechanisms such as the internet and personal computers (NRC, 2000). The design, testing, and implementation of new teaching methods will require scientists who are well trained in cognition, learning, and motivation, and who also are prepared to grapple with the challenges of extending laboratory-derived knowledge of these topics to teaching and learning in complex, real-world environments. Researchers who can straddle the worlds of cognitive science and education practice are very badly needed.

The needs of education policy and practice are served not only by research that directly addresses problem solution but also by research that raises questions and generates hypotheses

that can eventually lead to new applications or refinements of existing approaches (NRC, 2002). Frequently hypothesis-generating research relies on complex statistical methods that can tease out potential causal influences in large, correlational datasets. Statistical training is also needed in the design and analysis of experimental and quasi-experimental studies, as well as survey and observational data. While there are many doctoral training programs that focus on applied mathematics and statistics, the application of this expertise to problems in education requires that students be grounded in education content. That, in turn, requires a concentration of students and faculty who are focused on education topics.

In order to increase the supply of scientists and researchers in education who are prepared to conduct rigorous evaluation studies, develop new products and approaches that are grounded in a science of learning, design valid tests and measures, and explore data with sophisticated statistical methods, this initiative will fund the creation of innovative interdisciplinary research training programs in the education sciences. Grants will be awarded to institutions that can put together a program across disciplines such as psychology, political science, economics, statistics, sociology, education, and epidemiology that will provide intensive training in education research and statistics. Predoctoral students will graduate within a traditional discipline, e.g., economics, but will receive a certificate in education sciences, and will be expected to conduct dissertations on education topics.

4. REQUIREMENTS OF THE PROPOSED TRAINING PROGRAM

Proposals submitted to this competition must be organized around one or more interdisciplinary education research themes and involve a group of faculty members from a number of different relevant disciplines across the institution. Typically, interdisciplinarity will be achieved by crossing the boundaries of departments or schools within a single institution, but applications will be considered that achieve this goal through other means such as consortia of faculty from multiple institutions within the same geographic area. Applicants also may consider partnerships with entities currently engaged in education research and evaluation contract activities that would provide practical field experience in school-based research. The interdisciplinary theme provides a framework for integrating research and education and for promoting collaborative efforts within and across departments. Fellows should gain the breadth of skills and understanding necessary to conduct rigorous applied research in education while at the same time being well grounded in their major fields. The proposed training program should include the following features:

1. A Program Director (PD) who will be the head of the training program and is expected to be an essential participant in its educational and research activities. The PD will have overall responsibility for the administration of the award, management of the program, and interactions with the Institute;

2. A core of five or more outstanding faculty (including the PD) from two or more disciplines with proven track records in research and training in education-related topics;

3. One or more interdisciplinary themes, appropriate for doctoral level research in education, that serve as the foundation for program activities. Some examples would include (but not be limited to):

    - Interdisciplinary training in the design and implementation of randomized field trials in complex, real world settings such as schools. Training could encompass coursework and research typically carried out by faculty from departments of Psychology, Education, Economics and Sociology, as well as Schools of Public Health. Coursework could entail subjects such as research methods, epidemiology, statistics and measurement development as well as content-specific coursework.

    - Interdisciplinary training in cognitive sciences related to cognition and learning, including teaching and pedagogy. Training could encompass coursework and research typically conducted by faculty from departments of Psychology, Education, Computer Science, and Cognitive Neuroscience, as well as Schools of Engineering. Coursework could entail subjects such as research methods, statistics, measurement development, cognitive science, motivation, educational technology, human factors, software development, and information technology.

4. Institutional strategy and plan for the recruitment, mentoring, and retention of a full-time complement of at least 10 U.S. graduate fellows, including outreach efforts to encourage applications from members of underrepresented minorities and persons with disabilities;

5. Innovative graduate education and training mechanisms, curricula enhancement, and other educational features that foster strong interactions among participating fellows and faculty (e.g., new coursework, proseminar series, special colloquia, research collaboration involving graduate fellows and faculty members who are part of the consortia);

6. Provision of fellowship stipend support for all fellows who are admitted into the program. The default stipend amount is $30,000 per year (12 months) per fellow for up to 5 years. Applicants may propose other arrangements with justification, e.g., campus policies on levels of student stipends. All fellowship stipend recipients must be citizens or permanent residents of the U.S. In addition, fellowship recipients must be registered as full-time students during each term for which they will be receiving fellowship support. Fellows must make satisfactory progress towards the degree in order to remain eligible for program funds. The fellowship also will provide a cost-of-education allowance of up to $10,500 per year per fellow for tuition, health insurance, and normal fees. Funds must be requested for the Program Director to travel to Washington, DC for a two-day kickoff meeting in the Fall of 2004, and to support both Program Director and fellows' travel for one two-day meeting each year in Washington, DC, with other grantees and Institute staff. Funds also may be requested to support fellow registration and travel expenses to attend professional

conferences. Funds may be requested up to $25,000 per year to partially defray the routine costs of research by fellows (e.g., local travel to research sites, materials). Requests for grant supplements to support more extensive research projects by individual or collaborating fellows will be considered. Proposals requesting such supplements may be submitted to the Institute at any time during the award period;

7. There are no funds for faculty research or salaries with the following exceptions: (a) up to 5 months total of faculty salary support for the development of new program curricula; (b) up to two months of salary support per year for the Program Director for management purposes; (c) up to half the salary of a new faculty member who would be recruited specifically to enhance the breadth and quality of the interdisciplinary research training program; and (d) funds to support short-term visiting faculty who will enhance the breadth and quality of the interdisciplinary research training program. Funds may be requested to support colloquia as part of the training program, including but not limited to travel support for guest research and training presentations. Applicants may request up to six months of salary support per year for a Program Coordinator for logistical and clerical program support. Funds for facility renovation and maintenance are not allowed;

8. Fellows' doctoral dissertations and other required products must address practical questions in education. Dissertation committees must include at least two faculty members who are part of the interdisciplinary training program;

9. Administrative plan and organizational structure that ensures effective management of the program resources; and

10. Institutional commitment(s) to furthering the goals of the training program and creating a supportive environment for research and education.

5. APPLICATIONS AVAILABLE

Application forms and instructions for the electronic submission of applications will be available for this program of research no later than March 11, 2004, from the following web site:

https://ies.constellagroup.com

6. MECHANISM OF SUPPORT

The Institute intends to award grants for periods up to 5 years pursuant to this request for applications.

7. FUNDING AVAILABLE

Awards will be made in amounts ranging from $500,000 to $1,000,000 (total cost) per year for a duration of five years. The amount of the award will depend on the scope of the program and the number of fellows to be supported on stipends. Although the plans of the Institute include this training program, awards pursuant to this request for applications are contingent upon the availability of funds and the receipt of a sufficient number of meritorious applications. The number of programs funded depends upon the number of high quality applications submitted.

8. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Academic institutions in the United States and its territories that grant the Ph.D. degree in fields relevant to education may submit proposals under this competition. Training programs may involve more than one institution, but a single institution must accept overall management responsibility for the program (34 CFR 74.51(a)).

9. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Program Directors will be asked to submit a yearly report due one month prior to the annual meeting assessing the effectiveness of the program and describing the status of fellows in the program.

Research associated with this training program must be relevant to U.S. education. Fellowship recipients and others associated with the program are expected to publish or otherwise make publicly available the results of the work supported through this training program.

Predoctoral fellowship recipients and Program Directors must attend one two-day meeting each year in Washington, DC, with other grantees and Institute staff.

10. LETTER OF INTENT

A letter indicating a potential applicant's intent to submit an application is optional, but encouraged, for each application. The letter of intent must be submitted electronically by the date listed at the beginning of this document, using the instructions provided at the following web site:

https://ies.constellagroup.com

The letter of intent should include a descriptive title, the interdisciplinary research training theme(s) that the application will address, and a brief description of the proposed training program (no longer than one page, single-spaced, using a 12 point font without compression or kerning); the name, institutional affiliation, address, telephone number and e-mail address of the Program Director; and the name and institutional affiliation of four or more key faculty members. The letter of intent should provide an estimated budget request by year, and a total budget request. Although the letter of intent is optional, is not binding, and does not enter into the review of subsequent applications, the information that it contains allows Institute staff to estimate the potential workload to plan the review.

11. SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION

Applications must be submitted **electronically by 8:00 p.m**. **Eastern Time** on the application receipt date, using the ED standard forms and the instructions provided at the following web site:

https://ies.constellagroup.com

Application forms and instructions for the electronic submission of applications will be available for this program no later than March 11, 2004. Potential applicants should check this site for

information about the electronic submission procedures that must be followed and the software that will be required.

The application form approved for this program is OMB Number 1890-0009.

12. CONTENTS AND PAGE LIMITS OF APPLICATION

All applications and proposals for Institute funding must be self-contained within specified page limitations. Internet Web site addresses (URLs) may not be used to provide information necessary to the review because reviewers are under no obligation to view the Internet sites.

Sections described below, and summarized in Table 1, represent the body of a proposal submitted to the Institute and should be organized in the order listed below. Sections *a* (ED 424) through *h* (Appendix A) are required parts of the proposal. All sections must be submitted electronically.

Observe the page number limitations given in Table 1.

Table 1

Section	**Page Limit**	**Additional Information**
a. Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424)	n/a	
b. Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524)	n/a	
c. Project Abstract	1	
d. Training Program Narrative	20	Figures, charts, tables, and diagrams may be included in Appendix A
e. Reference List	no limit	Complete citations, including titles and all authors
f. Curriculum Vita of Key Personnel	no limit	No more than 3 pages for each key person
g. Budget Narrative	no limit	
h. Appendix A	15	

a. *Application for Federal Education Assistance (ED 424).* The form and instructions are available on the website.

b. *Budget Information Non-Construction Programs (ED 524).* The application must include a budget for each year of support requested and a cumulative budget for the full term of requested Institute support. Applicants must provide budget information for each project year using the ED 524 form (a link to the form is provided on the application website at https://ies.constellagroup.com). ED 524 form has three sections: A, B, and C.

Instructions for Sections A and B are included on the form. Instructions for Section C are as follows. Section C must provide an itemized budget breakdown for each project year, for each budget category listed in Sections A and B. Section C may be submitted as an

Excel spreadsheet with an itemized listing of project costs accompanying the budget narrative uploaded as part of the PDF file. For personnel, include a listing of percent effort for each project year, as well as the cost. Section C should also include a listing of each piece of equipment, itemization of supplies into separate categories, and itemization of travel requests (e.g. conference travel, etc.) into separate categories. Any other expenses should be itemized by category and unit cost. For multi-institution training programs, the lead institution shall submit the proposal, with other participating institutions included as subcontractors (34 CFR 74.5). Budgets shall be provided for the overall project as well as individually for the lead institution and for each subcontractor. U.S. Department of Education policy (34 CFR 75.562 (c)(2)) limits indirect cost reimbursement on a training grant to the recipient's actual indirect costs, as determined by its negotiated indirect cost rate agreement, or eight percent of a modified total direct cost base, whichever amount is less. For the purposes of this competition, a modified total direct cost base is defined as total direct costs less stipends, tuition and related fees, and capital expenditures of $5,000 or more.

c. *Project Abstract.* The *project abstract* is limited to one page and must include: (1) The title of the training program; (2) the name and institutional affiliation of the PD; and (3) a brief description of the proposed training program, highlighting its key interdisciplinary educational and research features.

d. *Proposed Training Program Narrative.* Incorporating the requirements outlined under the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Program, the *training program narrative* provides the majority of the information on which reviewers will evaluate the proposal and should include the following sections (1 through 4) in the order listed:

(1) <u>Detailed Description of the Proposed Training Program (suggested: 14-17 pages)</u> Describe the overall theme(s), structure, goals, and anticipated impact of the proposed interdisciplinary research training program. Describe its thematic basis and unifying aspects, noting the various interdisciplinary educational and research activities to be offered. Include a discussion of what is missing from graduate education and training in your current program and what could be done more effectively, including overcoming disciplinary and institutional barriers to genuine interdisciplinary research training. Discuss how the proposed program will address these issues. Describe the graduate education and training mechanisms that are essential to the proposed program, highlighting its new or innovative features. Outline ongoing lines of education research being conducted by the proposed faculty and how research practica and other training activities will be incorporated into the training program. Discuss how the proposed program will address the issues raised in this request for applications. Discuss potential career development opportunities to be provided to fellowship recipients. List concrete strategies for advertising the program and recruiting fellows and the approximate number of fellows to be admitted to the program. Address how recruitment procedures will encourage the participation of underrepresented minorities and persons with disabilities.

(2) Institutional Commitment, Management, and Program Evaluation (suggested: 3-4 pages)
Describe the commitment of the institution(s) at all appropriate administrative levels to supporting the goals of the proposed training program and to creating a supportive environment for interdisciplinary education research. Applicants should describe the recruitment and retention of graduate students at the institution (s) over the last three years, including information (e.g., demographics, average GRE scores) for applicants and enrollees, and the number of doctorates awarded, including average time to degree. This information may be listed in tabular format in Appendix A. A supporting letter of commitment from the senior administration of all participating institutions must be included in Appendix A. Describe plans and procedures for the overall management of the program. These plans should include clear and fair procedures for the allocation of program funds, including the amount and duration of fellowship support, management of day-to-day operations, etc. Describe plans for assessing the overall effectiveness of the training program (include a list of measures to be collected and analyzed on a year-to-year basis).

(3) Personnel (suggested: 1-2 pages)
Include brief descriptions of the qualifications of key personnel, including the Program Director and four or more other key faculty members, specifying their proposed role in the training program (information on personnel should also be provided in their curriculum vitae).

(4) Resources (suggested: 1-2 pages)
Provide a description of the resources available to support the training program at the participating institution(s) including field settings (e.g., schools, software development labs) with which the institution has a relationship that could support fellows' training and research projects.

The training program narrative is limited to the equivalent of 20 pages, where a "page" is 8.5 in. x 11 in., on one side only, with 1 inch margins at the top, bottom, and both sides. Single space all text in the training program narrative. To ensure that the text is easy for reviewers to read and that all applicants have the same amount of available space in which to describe their projects, applicants must adhere to the type size and format specifications for the entire training program narrative including footnotes. See frequently asked questions available at https://ies.constellagroup.com on or before March 11, 2004.

Conform to the following four requirements:

(1) The height of the letters must not be smaller than 12 point;

(2) Type density, including characters and spaces, must be no more than 15 characters per inch (cpi). For proportional spacing, the average for any representative section of text must not exceed 15 cpi;

(3) No more than 6 lines of type within a vertical inch;

(4) Margins, in all directions, must be at least 1 inch.

Applicants should check the type size using a standard device for measuring type size, rather than relying on the font selected for a particular word processing/printer combination. Figures, charts, tables, and figure legends may be smaller in size but must be readily legible. The type size used must conform to all four requirements. Small type size makes it difficult for reviewers to read the application. Adherence to type size and line spacing requirements is also necessary so that no applicant will have an unfair advantage, by using small type, or providing more text in their applications. **Note, these requirements apply to the PDF file as submitted**. As a practical matter, applicants who use 12 point Times New Roman without compressing, kerning, condensing or other alterations typically meet these requirements.

Use only black and white in graphs, diagrams, tables, and charts. The application must contain only material that reproduces well when photocopied in black and white.

The 20-page limit does *not* apply to the ED 424 form, the one-page abstract, the ED 524 form and budget narrative justification, the curriculum vitae, or reference list. Reviewers are able to conduct the highest quality review when applications are concise and easy to read, with pages numbered consecutively.

e. *Reference List*. Please include complete citations, including titles and all authors, for literature cited in the training program narrative.

f. *Brief Curriculum Vita of Key Personnel*. Abbreviated curriculum vita should be provided for the Program Director and other key faculty members. Each vita is limited to 3 pages and should include information sufficient to demonstrate that personnel possess training and expertise commensurate with their duties. <u>The vita should include current Federal award support, including other training grants.</u> The curriculum vita must adhere to the margin, format, and font size requirements described in the training program narrative section.

g. *Budget Narrative*. The *budget narrative* must provide sufficient detail to allow reviewers to judge whether reasonable costs have been attributed to the training program. It must include the time commitments and brief descriptions of the responsibilities of key faculty. *The budget justification should correspond to the itemized breakdown of project costs that is provided in ED 524 form Section C*. A justification for equipment purchase, supplies, travel and other related project costs should also be provided in the budget narrative for each project year outlined in Section C.

h. *Appendix A*. In A*ppendix A*, the applicant must provide support letters from all participating institutions. The letter(s) should include enough information to make it clear that the author of the letter understands the nature of the commitment of time, space, and resources to the training program that will be required if the application is funded.

Applicants also may include any additional figures, charts, or tables that supplement the training program narrative in this section. Appendix A is limited to 15 pages.

Please note that applicants selected for funding will be required to submit the following certifications and assurances before a grant is issued:

(1) SF 424B - Assurances-Non-Construction Programs
(2) ED-80-0013 - Certification Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension and other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements
(3) ED 80-0014 (if applicable) - Lower Tier Certification
(4) SF-LLL (if applicable) - Disclosure of Lobbying Activities

13. APPLICATION PROCESSING

Applications must be received by **8:00 p.m. Eastern time** on the application receipt date listed in the heading of this request for applications. Upon receipt, each application will be reviewed for completeness and for responsiveness to this request for applications. Applications that do not address specific requirements of this request will be returned to the applicants without further consideration.

14. PEER REVIEW PROCESS

Applications that are complete and responsive to this request will be evaluated for scientific and pedagogical merit. Reviews will be conducted in accordance with the review criteria stated below by a panel of scientists who have substantive expertise appropriate to the request for applications.

Each application will be assigned to at least two primary reviewers who will complete written evaluations of the application, identifying strengths and weaknesses related to each of the review criteria. Primary reviewers will independently assign a score for each criterion, as well as an overall score, for each application they review. Based on the overall scores assigned by primary reviewers, an average overall score for each application will be calculated and a preliminary rank order of applications prepared before the full peer review panel convenes to complete the review of applications.

The full panel will consider only those applications deemed to have the highest merit, as reflected by the preliminary rank order and the most competitive proposals will be discussed and scored.

15. REVIEW CRITERIA

The goal of Institute-supported programs is to contribute to the solution of education problems and to provide reliable information about the education practices that support learning and improve academic achievement and access to education for all students. Reviewers will be expected to assess the following aspects of an application in order to judge the likelihood that the proposed interdisciplinary research training program will have a substantial impact on the pursuit of that goal. Information pertinent to each of these criteria is also described above in the section on Requirements of the Proposed Training Program and in the description of the training program narrative, which appears in the section on Contents and Page Limits of Application.

Significance	Does the applicant make a compelling case for the potential contribution of the proposed interdisciplinary research training program?
Program Plan	Does the applicant present (a) a strong plan for the proposed training program; (b) a clear interdisciplinary orientation that emphasizes rigorous training in research methodology; and (c) an emphasis on research that addresses practical problems in education? Does the proposed plan meet the requirements described in the section on the Requirements of the Proposed Training Program and in the description of the training program narrative in the section on Contents and Page Limits?
Personnel	Does the description of the personnel make it apparent that the Program Director and key faculty possess the training and experience and will commit sufficient time to competently implement the proposed training program?
Resources	Does the applicant have the facilities, equipment, supplies, and other resources required to support the proposed training activities? Do the commitments of all participating institutions show support for the implementation and success of the project?

16. RECEIPT AND REVIEW SCHEDULE

Letter of Intent Receipt Date: March 11, 2004
Application Receipt Date: May 27, 2004, 8:00 p.m. Eastern time
Earliest Anticipated Start Date: September 1, 2004

17. AWARD DECISIONS

The following will be considered in making award decisions:

Overall strength of the proposed training program as determined by the peer review process
Responsiveness to the requirements of this request
Performance and use of funds under a previous Federal award
Contribution to the overall goals described in this request
Availability of funds

18. INQUIRIES MAY BE SENT TO:

Dr. James Griffin
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Suite 611a
Washington, DC 20208

Email : James.Griffin@ed.gov
Telephone: (202) 219-2280

19. PROGRAM AUTHORITY

20 U.S.C. 9501 et seq., the "Education Sciences Reform Act of 2002," Title I of Public Law 107-279, November 5, 2002. This program is not subject to the intergovernmental review requirements of Executive Order 12372.

20. APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 77, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86 (part 86 applies only to Institutions of Higher Education), 97, 98, and 99. In addition 34 CFR part 75 is applicable, except for the provisions in 34 CFR 75.100, 75.101(b), 75.102, 75.103, 75.105, 75.109(a), 75.200, 75.201, 75.209, 75.210, 75.211, 75.217, 75.219, 75.220, and 75.230.

21. REFERENCES

American Educational Research Association (AERA). (2002). *Demographic characteristics of AERA membership in 2001-2002*. Retrieved December 23, 2003 from http://www.aera.net/about/reports/annual/02/tables.pdf.

American Psychological Association (APA), Research Office. (in press). *2001 Doctorate Employment Survey*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Boruch, R., de Moya, D., and Snyder, B. (2001). The importance of randomized field trials in education and related fields. In R. Boruch and F. Mosteller (Eds.). *Evidence Matters*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2002, November). Rigorous evidence: The key to progress in education? Lessons from medicine, welfare and other fields. *Proceedings of The Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy Forum*, Washington, DC.

Cook, T.D. (2001). Sciencephobia: Why education researchers reject randomized experiments. *Education Next*. Retrieved January 5 from www.educationnext.org.

Hoffer, T.B., S. Sederstrom, L. Selfa, V.Welch, M. Hess, S. Brown, S. Reyes, K. Webber, and I. Guzman-Barron. (2003). *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2002*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. (The report gives the results of Data collected in the Survey of Earned Doctorates, conducted for six Federal agencies, NSF, NIH, USED, NEH, USDA, and NASA by NORC.).

National Research Council. (1999). *Improving student learning: A strategic plan for education Research and its utilization*. Committee on a Feasibility Study for a Strategic Education Research Program. Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. J. Bransford, A. Brown, and R. Cocking (Eds.). Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice. S. Donovan,

J. Bransford, and J. Pellegrino (Eds.). Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences in Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Research Council (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Committee on Scientific Principles for Education Research. R.J. Shavelson and L. Towne (Eds.). Center for Education. Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Viadero, D. (2004). The skills gap. *Education Week*, 23 (16), 30, 31, 33.

Whitehurst, G. J. (2003). The Institute of Education Sciences: New wine, new bottles. *Presentation given at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. Retrieved on December 20, 2003 from http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/ies.html.