FORMAT SPECIFICATIONS

Files can be loaded onto the FastLane server either as PDF files or, in many cases, directly from the word processor files that you used to create them. However, as the conversion algorithm on FastLane occasionally causes issues with the formatting of graphics and complicated formulae in the text, OCG recommends converting the files to PDF before uploading them to FastLane. All individual files or components of an NSF proposal must adhere to the following specifications:

Unless entered directly on FastLane as text (e.g., the project summary or current and pending support information), **all pages** of **every** document must be numbered, even if the document is only one page in length. Letters of collaboration can be paginated, but do not have to be.

Only the following fonts (and font sizes) are acceptable for body text in NSF proposals:
* Arial, Courier New (**not recommended**), Palatino Linotype (no smaller than 10 point)
* Times New Roman, Computer Modern (no smaller than 11 point)
* Helvetica, Palatino (Macintosh users only, no smaller than 10 point)

Symbol fonts may be used to insert Greek letters or other special characters, but the font size requirement still applies. Smaller type may be used for figures, graphs, diagrams, charts, tables, figure legends, and footnotes: but it must be legible and all text must be in black. Colors can be used in figures.

Paper must be standard size (8.5 x 11 inches), with margins of at least one inch on all sides. This will be the first thing that NSF checks after proposal submission, and if a proposal is non-compliant, it will be returned without review. You **may** be allowed to correct the issue and update the proposal, but there is no guarantee that this will happen and NSF is not required to allow you that opportunity.

Further details on all applicable proposal guidelines can be found in the Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG, https://www.nsf.gov/publications/pub_summ.jsp?ods_key=nsf17001) on the NSF website. (Be sure to check that you're working with the latest or most current version.)

PAGE LIMITS

The standard page limits for NSF proposals are as follows. Please note that individual funding opportunities may contain different guidelines that modify or supersede the standard rules. *Be sure to check the requirements listed in the solicitation for the competition for which you are applying!*

Section	Page limit
Project Summary	1
Project Description	15
References Cited	None
Biographical Sketches	2 per person
Budget Justification	3 pages (plus 3 additional pages for each subcontract, if any)
Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources	None
Data Management Plan	2 per proposal
Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan	1 per proposal

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS, CO-PIs, AND "SENIOR PERSONNEL"

The principal investigator (PI; or project director, PD, for centers and large facilities: NSF uses these two terms interchangeably) is responsible for the scientific or technical direction of the project. A co-PI is any other individual who has a responsibility for the leadership and management of the project. NSF allows up to four individuals to be designated as co-PIs, but makes no distinction in scientific stature between the PI and the co-PIs. The PI and all the co-PIs, if any, are expected to play a significant role in the design and conduct of the proposed research, to have ongoing involvement in the work proposed throughout the project, and are jointly responsible for submission of all required project reports. Anyone designated as either PI or co-PI is considered vital to the success of the project, and any significant changes to their participation on the project (including, but not limited to, removal from the project, replacement by another researcher, or absences longer than three months) require prior written approval from NSF.

NSF designates certain project participants as "senior personnel." These individuals must provide information about their educational background and other qualifications, and list all sources of current and pending support for their research and/or scholarship. Anyone who is designated as the PI, the project director, or named on the proposal cover sheet as a co-PI, is automatically considered to be senior personnel. Other faculty members (and in some cases, research staff), whether at CU or at another institution, who are participating on the project in substantive ways, can be designated as senior personnel. If CU is subcontracting a part of the project to another institution, one member of the project team at each institution receiving a subcontract will have to be designated as senior personnel (if they are not already listed on the cover sheet as a co-PI), to be associated with that institution's subcontract in FastLane. Otherwise, the decision about whether to designate someone as senior personnel is at the discretion of the project team's leadership. Unlike the PI and all co-PIs, NSF does not have to approve even substantial changes to other senior personnel's involvement with the project.

ELEMENTS OF AN NSF PROPOSAL

What follows are brief descriptions of the standard NSF proposal elements, and summaries of the guidelines and requirements governing each of them. Some proposals may request additional sections, or require specific items to be addressed in one or more proposal sections. Other proposals, especially pre-proposals and collaborative proposals submitted by multiple institutions, may not require all of these elements, and may impose different page lengths. Only NSF program solicitations (which will be identified at the top with a number such as "NSF 16-123," where the first two numbers indicate the fiscal year in which the solicitation was last revised) are allowed to deviate from the standard NSF guidelines contained in the Proposal & Award Policies & Procedures Guide (PAPPG), which are summarized here. If you are applying to a program description (which has a number like NSF PD 16-1234), you must follow the PAPPG guidelines.

Any changes to the PAPPG guidelines will be explicitly stated in the program solicitation, e.g., needing to address certain questions in the project description, leaving out information about prior NSF support in a pre-proposal, adding supplementary documents describing the evaluation plan, or providing additional documentation about conflicts of interest with members of the project team. If the solicitation does not specify any changes, then the PAPPG guidelines apply. So read the solicitation carefully!

NSF has been adding automatic compliance checks to FastLane in the last few years. These happen automatically whenever a proposal is released to the sponsored research office (OCG at CU) or when the "check" button is clicked on FastLane. Mostly, these automated checks make sure that required files have been uploaded, although some more sophisticated checks have been added for things like page lengths in certain sections. However, the FastLane checks do not include all elements of the proposal, and do not cover all of the applicable requirements. A proposal that passes FastLane's validation may still be returned without review if NSF program staff find a compliance issue.

In some cases (especially, but not always, involving pre-proposals), even though the solicitation says that a document is not required, FastLane will still check for a document in that slot. In these cases, you will need to enter text (or upload a file) in the appropriate place, indicating that the element in question is

either not required or has been uploaded elsewhere. Otherwise, FastLane will consider the element to be missing and will not allow the proposal to be submitted.

1. Project Summary

The project summary must be suitable for publication (so do not include any proprietary or confidential information in it), and should summarize the proposed research in terms that an educated lay reader could understand. It must be written in the third person, and should provide a statement of the objectives of the proposed research and the methods to be employed. Your first paragraph should contain a statement of the proposed research goal. Do not make reviewers hunt for this statement: doing so has a significant adverse impact on the likelihood that your proposal will be selected for funding.

Unless it contains special characters (e.g., Greek letters, mathematical symbols, etc.) that are not available in the standard ASCII character set, the project summary must be entered as text in three discrete boxes on FastLane. The summary must fit on a single page. FastLane is employing 1.5-line spacing for this section, so there is less room than one might think. Text must be entered in all three boxes, or else the proposal will either not be accepted or it will be returned without review. There is no requirement about how much text must go in each of the three boxes.

The three boxes are as follows:
- Overview (a self-contained description of the proposed work, including a statement of objectives and methods to be employed)
- Intellectual Merit
- Broader Impacts.

The latter two boxes are to describe the ways in which the proposed activity meets the respective review criteria. NSF has provided resources describing some of the more common broader impacts:

- https://www.nsf.gov/od/oia/special/broaderimpacts/
- https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf022/bicexamples.pdf

Please note: you do not have to address each of the items discussed in these examples. Rather, choose the one(s) that are most appropriate for the work you are proposing to do. But if you mention a broader impact in the project summary, make sure to address that point in the project description as well.

If your project summary contains special characters that cannot be entered into the FastLane text boxes, you must check the applicable box (located just above the Overview text box, though it can be difficult to spot) indicating that you're uploading a PDF document. The summary must still include the same information described above, including distinct headings for each of the three sections. It may not be more than one page long. Upload the summary as a supplementary document after checking the appropriate box on the FastLane proposal module.

2. Project Description

The project description should provide a clear statement of the work to be undertaken and must include the following information:
- objectives for the period of the proposed work and expected significance;
- relation to longer-term goals of the PI's project; and
- relation to the present state of knowledge in the field, to work in progress by the PI under other support and to work in progress elsewhere.

The project description must be self-contained, including all the material necessary to understand and properly review the proposed research. In short, tell them what you're proposing to do, why it's important that this work be done, why you're the right person (or group of people, if it's a collaborative project) to do it, how you'll know if you were successful, and what other benefits might result if the project is funded.

Do not include URLs in the project description. Reviewers are under no obligation to view the sites you point to, and the site may change between the time the proposal is submitted and the time it is reviewed. If a website contains information that might be relevant to the project (such as a data archive, a consultant or subcontractor discussing their qualifications and past experience), you can name the site or otherwise describe its relevance to the project in the project description, and then include the URL in the

References Cited section. Even then, however, there is no guarantee that reviewers or program staff will actually view the site.

The project description should outline the general plan of work, including the broad design of activities to be undertaken, and, where appropriate, provide a clear description of experimental methods and procedures and plans for preservation, documentation, and sharing of data, samples, physical collections, curriculum materials and other related research and education products. It must contain *a separate section* on broader impacts that *must be labeled* "Broader Impacts" (NSF has been returning proposals that do not use this exact heading). This section describes the broader impacts resulting from the proposed activities, addressing one or more of the following as appropriate for the project:

- how the project will integrate research and education by advancing discovery and understanding while at the same time promoting teaching, training, and learning;
- ways in which the proposed activity will broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.);
- how the project will enhance the infrastructure for research and/or education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships;
- how the results of the project will be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding; and
- potential benefits of the proposed activity to society at large.

If the PI or any co-PI identified on the project has received NSF funding with a start date within the past five years, each person with such funding must contribute to a separate section, labeled "Results from Prior NSF Support," describing the results of that prior research. An individual who has had more than one NSF award within the last five years should choose the single award that best matches with the work being proposed (or that best demonstrates their capacity to manage similar projects, if no award relates to the work being proposed), and describe those results. If two or more members of the proposal team worked on the same previously funded NSF award, they do not each have to list it. This section may not exceed five pages in length, and those pages count against the overall 15-page limit for the Project Description (i.e., you do not get additional space to describe prior results). The following information must be provided:

    a. the NSF award number, amount, and period of support for each grant;

    b. the project title;

    c. a summary of the results of the completed work, including accomplishments, with separate discussions (and a header for each) of the intellectual merit and broader impacts;

    d. publications resulting from the NSF award (it is sufficient to mention the number of publications and highlighting any of them that is particularly significant; the actual publications can be listed in the References Cited section);

    e. evidence of research products and their availability, including (but not limited to) data, samples, physical collections, software, models, and other related research products (if any); and

    f. if the proposal is for a renewal of support, a description of the relation between the completed work and the work being proposed.

The Results from Prior NSF Support section can be placed anywhere within the project description that makes sense. If your current proposal is a continuation or an extension of the previously funded work, it's best to start the project description with the previous results, and then explain how the current proposal builds or expands on them. On the other hand, if the previous results aren't really relevant to the current project, it's better to save that section for the end of the narrative—that allows you to get right to the point of the current proposal, without distracting the reviewers from what you're trying to do this time.

Organizations are required to certify that the institution submitting the proposal has a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the responsible and ethical conduct of research to undergraduates, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers who will be supported by NSF to conduct research. The details of the training plan do not have to be included in proposals, but they are subject to review upon request. However, if additional training is needed in specific areas or subjects, these should be handled by the PI and/or the relevant department(s) or unit(s) and described briefly in the project description. For information about relevant CU resources, please see: http://www.colorado.edu/innovate/rcr.

If your proposed research involves working with human subjects (including the collection of survey data), working with live vertebrate animals, or working with either recombinant DNA or biohazards, you may need to describe in the narrative how the work will be done to ensure the safety of all concerned, and you will have to get your research protocol reviewed by the appropriate institutional agency. Unless exempted by the appropriate committee(s), you must have an approved research protocol in place before any proposal award can be processed and before spending any awarded research funds. It can be very helpful to contact the relevant committee(s) at the proposal stage, and in some cases, this may be required. Information about these committees can be found at the following websites:

- Human Research & Institutional Review Board (for research involving human subjects): http://www.colorado.edu/innovate/irb
- Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (for research involving vertebrate animals): http://www.colorado.edu/innovate/iacuc
- Institutional Biosafety Committee (for research involving recombinant DNA, biohazards, select agents, or bloodborne pathogens): https://ehs.colorado.edu/lab-support/biosafety/

Even if it is not necessary to have these approvals in hand at proposal submission, you should begin to prepare for the process once it becomes probable that an award may be made, if not before. Otherwise, you won't be able to start working on your project or spend any money until the approvals are in place.

3. Bibliography/References Cited

Provide a bibliography of all works cited in the project description. Each reference must include the names of all authors (in the same order in which they appear on the publication), either the article and journal title or the book and chapter title, volume number, page numbers (both starting and ending), and year of publication. Do not use "et al." in references unless the publication has an extremely large number of authors (10 or more), even if the reference style you're using would normally call for it. NSF does check the references, and will return proposals without review if they are not formatted correctly. If the document cited is available electronically, NSF encourages researchers to include the URL or DOI, but this is not required.

4. Biographical Sketch

Biographical sketches must be included for all senior personnel. If another named person (postdoctoral researcher, other professionals, or student research assistant) has "exceptional qualifications that merit consideration in the evaluation of the proposal," biographical sketches may be included for them as long as they are clearly marked "Other Personnel Information" and appended to a document uploaded for one or more of the senior personnel. Biographical sketches may not exceed two pages per person, and must follow the NSF format exactly. OCG has been seeing an increasing number of proposals returned for correction of non-compliant biographical sketches, and NSF has the option of simply returning the proposal without review if all of the required information is not present or if the prescribed format is not followed.

Do **not** include any personal information such as home address, home telephone number, citizenship or marital status, date of birth, hobbies, etc. NSF does not allow the listing of awards and honors in biographical sketches. Do not provide information about grant funding in the biographical sketch: this is handled in current and pending support. The following information must be provided, **in the order and format specified**:

a) Professional Preparation. List your undergraduate and graduate education, and any postdoctoral training, in **chronological** order, as indicated below:

Undergraduate Institution(s)	Location	Major	Degree & Year
Graduate Institution(s)	Location	Major	Degree & Year
Postdoctoral Institution(s)	Location	Area	Inclusive Dates (years)

b) Appointments. List, in **reverse** chronological order, beginning with your current position, all of your academic/professional appointments (note: you do not have to include graduate teaching or research assistantships in this list)

c) Products: a list of (i) up to five products most closely related to the proposed project; and (ii) up to five other significant products, whether or not related to the proposed project. Acceptable products must be citable and accessible, and include, but are not limited to, publications, datasets, software, patents, and copyrights. Do not include manuscripts that have not yet been submitted, invited lectures, or additional lists of research products. These will not be accepted or evaluated. If you only include traditional publications in this section, it is acceptable to refer to it as the "Publications" section. Otherwise, use the header "Products." As with the references cited section, complete bibliographic information must be provided for all publications. If you include conference presentations in this section, you must either give a complete citation (including page numbers) for the presentation in the conference's proceedings volume, or else provide the dates of the conference and the specific date on which the presentation was given.

d) Synergistic Activities: A list of up to five (and no more than five!) examples that demonstrate the broader impact of the individual's professional and scholarly activities that focuses on the integration and transfer of knowledge as well as its creation. Examples could include, among others: innovations in teaching and training (e.g., development of curricular materials and pedagogical methods); contributions to the science of learning; development and/or refinement of research tools; computation methodologies, and algorithms for problem-solving; development of databases to support research and education; broadening the participation of groups underrepresented in science, mathematics, engineering and technology; and service to the scientific and engineering community outside of the individual's immediate organization. Please note that you are only allowed to list *five* synergistic activities. While NSF formerly allowed a narrative paragraph for this section, lately program staff have been requiring a bulleted or numbered list format.

A small group of NSF programs (mainly those involving large centers or collaborative projects that involve multiple partner institutions) has begun requiring a separate list of individuals who have conflicts of interest with one or more members of the project team. This information may be in place of or in addition to the information contained in the Collaborators and Other Affiliations document, and may have to be uploaded as a supplementary document or emailed separately to a program officer at the time of proposal submission or shortly thereafter. If this type of document is required, the program solicitation will specify the type of information to be provided and the format in which it should be submitted.

Each senior person must submit a separate biographical sketch: NSF no longer allows these to be combined into a single PDF file and submitted under the name of the principal investigator.

5. Budget Justification

In addition to the proposal budget, which your OCG proposal analyst will help you to develop, the proposal must also have a budget justification (up to 3 pages in length) that documents, explains, and justifies each of the budget items. Your proposal analyst can provide you with a template that will help you to organize the budget justification so it follows the NSF budget format (which will make it easier for reviewers and NSF program staff to understand how all the pieces fit together).

At a minimum, you'll want to explain the major cost items, why they're important to the project, and how you arrived at the cost estimate. You'll need to provide more information about requests that are unusual (costing more or less than what the program is used to seeing, or involving unique resources or locations that are necessary to the project). These are not necessarily deal-breakers, you just need to help the reviewers and the program staff understand how they integrate with the project, and demonstrate that you arrived at your cost estimates in a reasonable fashion.

For proposals where CU subcontracts part of the work to another institution (including another CU campus), those institutions will also have to provide justifications for their budget requests (up to 3 additional pages per subcontract). Normally, these will come from the other institutions.

6. Facilities, Equipment, and Other Resources

This section is intended to assess the adequacy of the resources available to perform the proposed work. List only those things that are directly relevant to the proposal: don't list every piece of equipment that's in your lab! Include an aggregated description of the internal and external resources (both physical and personnel) that the organization and its collaborators will provide to the project if it is funded. While

information provided in this section is not subject to audit (as information provided in the budget and budget justification sections *is*), NSF will expect you to make good on any commitments described here.

The description should be narrative in nature and must not include any quantifiable financial information (i.e., do not provide information on costs, annual appropriations, etc.). Avoid using words such as "contribute" or "share" (unless you're describing sharing of physical space or other resources between one or more units or institutions), as these can be construed as providing cost sharing. Describe all resources as if they were already available to the project (i.e., do not indicate that a particular piece of equipment or another resource was, or is slated to be, purchased to secure grant funding or contingent on its approval).

For senior personnel who are not requesting salary on the proposal budget, their contributions to and participation on the project must be described in this section. The same should be done for any unfunded collaborators involved. For unfunded collaborations, each collaborator (other than the PI, co-PIs, or other senior personnel at CU) should document his/her willingness to participate in the project in a letter of collaboration, which should be submitted along with the proposal as a supplementary document.

7. Current and Pending Support

Each individual designated as senior personnel on the project must provide information on all current and pending support for ongoing projects and proposals, ***including the current proposal.*** This section of the proposal should *never* be empty. Normally, the current proposal is the first item listed for each individual, although this is not a requirement. "Current" support means an award has been received and work is ongoing. "Pending" means that the proposal has been submitted, but a funding decision has not yet been made by the sponsor, or that a formal award notification has not been received.

All support from ***any*** source (federal, state, local, or foreign government agencies; public or private foundations; industrial or other commercial organizations), *including internal CU funding in support of an investigator's research or scholarship*, must be listed. Any project involving or requiring a portion of the individual's time must be listed, even if the individual in question is not receiving salary support from the project(s). Do not include start-up funds or other sources of funding that do not require a commitment of your time. The following information must be provided for each listed project:

- The project's title (with the words "this proposal" added in parentheses after the title for the current project)
- Source of support
- Project location (usually the name of the institution that received the funding)
- Total award amount (show the total award amount for the entire award period covered, including indirect costs, if any; for NSF collaborative projects where each institution received its own award, show only the amount of the CU award, and not the total for the entire project)
- Starting and ending dates of the project
- Support type (current, pending, submission planned in near future, or transfer of support)
- Person-months per year committed to the project (calendar, academic, or summer, or any combination thereof)

Each senior person must provide his or her own current and pending support information. NSF no longer allows the practice of combining all of the files into a single PDF document and uploading it under the name of the principal investigator. However, there are some solicitations that require a combined table listing this information for all members of the project team, sometimes in addition to the individual statements, and sometimes in place of those statements. Be sure to check the solicitation carefully to determine what information on collaborators must be provided, and the specific format required.

8. Supplementary Documentation

Data Management Plan. Proposals must include a supplementary document, no more than two pages long, labeled "Data Management Plan." This document should describe how the project will comply with NSF and federal government policies on the dissemination and sharing of research results and project data, and may include:

1. The types of data, samples, physical collections, software, curriculum materials, and other materials to be produced in the course of the project.

2. The standards to be used for data and metadata format and content. If there are no current standards, or if the existing standards are considered to be inadequate, this should be documented along with any proposed solutions or remedies.
3. Policies for access and sharing, including provisions for appropriate protection of privacy, confidentiality, security, intellectual property, or other rights or requirements.
4. Policies and provisions for re-use, re-distribution, and the production of derivatives.
5. Plans for archiving data, samples, and other research products, and for preserving access to them.

Most NSF directorates, divisions, and programs have established requirements (and provide guidance about sample plans) for data management. These can be found at this URL: http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/dmp.jsp. If guidance specific to the program is not available, then the requirements listed in the Grants Proposal Guide (and summarized above) apply. CU is also a partner institution with DMPTool (https://dmptool.org), which can provide templates and further guidance on developing data management plans for NSF and for other funders.

Postdoctoral Mentoring Plan. Any proposal requesting NSF support for a postdoctoral researcher must include a separate document (no more than **one page** in length) that describes the mentoring activities that will be provided for the postdoc(s) in question. A sample mentoring plan is available from NSF at https://www.nsf.gov/eng/iip/sbir/documents/Sample_Postdoc_Mentoring_Plan.doc. This document must be uploaded as a supplementary document, but mention should also be made in the project description at the appropriate place(s). Proposals that do not include this mentoring plan will be returned without review. For collaborative proposals submitted by multiple institutions, the postdoctoral mentoring plan is submitted only by the lead institution, and it must describe all of the mentoring activities associated with the project, regardless of the institution(s) that will actually provide them. Another good source of information and resources for preparing postdoctoral mentoring plans is the National Postdoctoral Association (http://www.nationalpostdoc.org/publications-5/mentoring-plans).

Documentation of Collaborations. If your proposal involves significant collaboration with someone not identified as a PI, co-PI, or other senior person on the proposal, you may wish to provide a biographical sketch (formatted as described above) for such people as a means of demonstrating their qualifications to do the work assigned to them. As indicated above, these biosketches need to be clearly marked as "Other Personnel Information" and should be combined with the PI's or one of the co-PI's biosketches and loaded in the biosketch section on FastLane. Also secure a letter from these individuals (except graduate students and postdocs), confirming their willingness to participate in the proposed work in the role(s) to which they have been assigned.

Letters of collaboration are not needed for co-PIs, but should be solicited from collaborators at other institutions, evaluators, consultants, etc., and anyone not at CU or in another department/unit at CU who is agreeing to support the project, if this is allowed under the terms of the solicitation to which you are applying. Increasingly, NSF is cutting back on the number of supplementary documents (especially letters of collaboration) that it allows on proposals, and often will require a specific format. Letters should contain specific commitments and be as descriptive as possible. Letters from colleagues "in support" of the proposal should not be submitted. (And if they are, NSF will either return the proposal without review or ask that the inappropriate letters be removed before sending the proposal out for review.)

However, please be sure to review the solicitation for the competition to which you are applying. Some competitions require specific kinds of supplementary documentation, and others do not allow any supplementary documents to be included. The guidelines for the specific competition trump the general rules presented above.

9. Single-Copy Documents

Collaborators & Other Affiliations. The information, formerly contained in Section E of the biographical sketch, on collaborators and other affiliations is now provided as a separate document for each senior person on the proposal. These are submitted as single-copy documents, and are only reviewed by NSF program staff: they are not sent to the proposal reviewers along with the other proposal documents. The information that must be provided in this document is as follows:

i. Collaborators and Co-Editors. An ***alphabetical*** list of all persons (including their current organizational affiliations) who are currently, or who have been collaborators or co-authors with the individual on a project, book, article, report, abstract or paper during the four years (48 months) preceding the submission of the proposal. Also include in this list individuals who are currently or who have been co-editors of a journal, compendium, or conference proceedings during the two years (24 months) preceding submission of the proposal. If there are no collaborators or co-editors to report, this should be so indicated.

ii. Graduate Advisors. A list of the names in alphabetical order of the individual's own graduate advisor(s) and principal postdoctoral sponsor(s), and their current organizational affiliations. If any of these individuals has retired or is deceased, their name must still be listed, and the last organizational affiliation must be provided, plus an indication that the individual is now retired or deceased.

iii. Ph.D. Advisor. List all of the students whose work you have supervised as a research adviser. If you know their current institutional affiliations, it's best to include those as a help to NSF program staff in ensuring they do not inadvertently ask someone who would be deemed to have a conflict of interest to review your proposal. You should not include in this list students for whom you were not their primary research advisor (i.e., a member of their dissertation committee). You are not required to list master's students, but you may if you wish to do so. If you have not yet supervised students as researchers or postdocs, you should indicate this and briefly explain why (i.e., you are a new faculty member, or you work in a department or a capacity where supervision of graduate research is not expected of you).

Beginning April 24, NSF will require all collaborators & other affiliations documents to be provided on an Excel spreadsheet rather than a Word document or PDF file. Download the spreadsheet at https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/coa.jsp and follow the instructions contained therein. Entries in each category must still be alphabetized before submitting the spreadsheet in FastLane; however, this can be done automatically by clicking on the down arrow in the column where names are entered for each section (see screen capture below) and selecting the "Sort A-Z" option from the menu.

P:	Graduate Advisors		
B ▼	Advisor/Advisee Name: ▼	Organizational Affiliation ▼	Optional (email, Department) ▼
G:	Claus, Santa	North Pole University	
T:	Wind, North	No fixed address	northwind@gmail.com
P:	Borealis, N. Aurora	Northern Star State	

NSF uses this information both to determine potential conflicts of interest (no one you name in any of these lists will normally be asked to review your proposal), but also to evaluate your record of supervising student research work. If you are asking for funds to support student researchers at any level, it will be important to demonstrate that you have done so successfully in the past.