

Cycle 8 Supplemental Call for Education and Public Outreach Proposals

Table of Contents:

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 The Chandra Program: Supplemental Call for EPO Proposals
 - 1.2 Program Oversight
 - 1.3 Proposal Review Process: Deadlines and Schedule
 - 1.4 Summary of the EPO CfP
 - 1.5 Cancellation of the CfP
 - 1.6 What's New in Cycle
 - 1.6.1 What's New in NASA's Education Program
 - 1.6.2 What's New in Chandra Cycle 8
 - 1.7 Proposal Submission
2. Proposal Submission Policies
 - 2.1 Who May Propose
 - 2.2 Proposal Confidentiality
3. Chandra Cycle 8 EPO Proposal Guidelines
 - 3.1 Applicable General Policies, Guidelines and Procedures
 - 3.2 EPO Evaluation Criteria
 - 3.2.1 Intrinsic Merit
 - 3.2.2 Relevance to NASA Objectives
 - 3.2.2.1 Background Notes
 - (1) Overall Guidelines for this Category
 - (2) Note on Modifications to Definitions and Explanations
 - (3) Alignment with Educational Standards
 - 3.2.2.2 Category Relevance Factors
 - 3.2.3 Cost
 - 3.2.4 Further Information about Evaluation Criteria
 - 3.3 More about Proposal Budget Guidelines
 - 3.3.1 Input to Proposal Forms
 - 3.3.2 Content
 - 3.3.3 Profit
 - 3.3.4 Computers and Equipment
 - 3.4 Evaluation and Selection
4. Proposal Submission
 - 4.1 Overview and Schedule of Process
 - 4.2 Proposal Content and Format
 - 4.3 Access to Proposal Forms
 - 4.4 Electronic Submission Process
5. Grant Award
6. Reporting Requirements
7. How to Get Help
 - 7.1 Proposal Submission
 - 7.2 Cycle 8 CfP
 - 7.3 SMD EPO Program

1. Introduction

1.1: The Chandra Program Supplemental Call for EPO Proposals

The Chandra X-ray Center invites U.S. based scientists whose research proposals have been selected in Stage 1 of the Cycle 8 Chandra X-ray Observatory (CXO) research peer review to participate in Cycle 8 of the CXO Education and Public Outreach supplemental (EPO) grant program. (Note: The U.S. is defined as the 50 states and the District of Columbia.)

NASA Space Science seeks to:

1. Share the excitement of space science discoveries with the public;
2. Enhance the quality of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education, particularly at the pre-college level; and
3. Help create our 21st century scientific and technical workforce.

Following the spirit and intent of NASA's Science Mission Directorate (SMD) national EPO program, the aim of the Chandra Cycle 8 supplemental EPO grant program is to encourage collaborative efforts among professional space scientists, professional educators, and public outreach specialists that would broaden knowledge and understanding of the latest discoveries of the Chandra X-ray Observatory, have a positive impact on the nation's education system, help develop the next generation of scientists and technical professionals, and promote the enhanced participation of underserved/ underutilized groups and women in science.

The Chandra Cycle 8 EPO proposals should have general intellectual linkage to the parent research program and to the science goals of the Chandra mission. The proposed program should provide intended audiences with current space science and/or related education content. The program or activity contain significant content based on NASA science or technology.

1.2 Program Oversight

The Chandra program is sponsored by NASA's Science Mission Directorate (SMD) and managed by NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC). The Chandra X-ray Center (CXC), which is funded by NASA via a contract to the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) in Cambridge, MA, has the responsibility for: the management of the Chandra science program, the Chandra Education and Public Outreach (EPO) program, the management of the peer reviews which recommend the allocation of observing time and funds and the allocation of supplementary EPO funds to the user community, the selection of the science and EPO proposals, and the operation of the satellite.

The funding associated with all awards funded by this Call for Proposals (CfP) flows from NASA through SAO to the CXC.

1.3 Proposal Review Process: Deadlines and Schedule

The Chandra Stage 1 peer review determines the scientific and technical merits of proposed science investigations. The US-based PIs of those science research proposals selected in Stage 1 are invited to submit a supplemental EPO proposal in response to this CfP.

Table 1.1: Schedule and Deadlines for the Chandra Cycle 8 EPO opportunity:

EVENT	DATE
EPO Supplemental CfP Release	July 2006
EPO Proposal Electronic Submission Deadline	5PM EDT, 20 October 2006
Hard Copy with Signed Institutional Endorsement	Received by SAO by 4PM EDT, 25 October 2006
Cycle 8 EPO Peer Review	December 2006
Selected EPO Proposals Announced	December 2006

Both the electronic and hard copy of the proposal must be identical. If they are not identical, the proposal will be deemed to be non-responsive.

Late Proposals will not be considered. We recommend submission well before the deadline to avoid possible last minute problems.

1.4 Summary of the EPO CfP

This supplemental CfP solicits EPO proposals from eligible Principal Investigators whose Chandra proposals have been selected in Stage 1. (See Section 2.1 for definitions of eligibility.) The proposed EPO program should have a general intellectual linkage to the science of the parent research proposal selected in Stage 1 and/or to the science goals of the Chandra mission. The primary goal of the Chandra mission is the investigation of the nature and physics of astronomical objects as revealed through their X-ray emission.

This supplemental CfP offers the opportunity for the submission of three types of EPO proposals.

Types of EPO Proposals:

1. Proposals from individual Chandra researchers for EPO programs: Grants up to \$15k;
2. Institutional proposals allowing several CXC-funded Chandra researchers located at a single institution to collectively plan and carry out a more ambitious program: Grants of \$15k per researcher up to \$50k for more than 3 collaborators; and

3. Team proposals allowing several CXC-funded Chandra researchers located at different institutions to collectively plan and carry out a more ambitious program: Grants of \$15k per researcher up to \$50k for more than 3 collaborators.

The total amount of funding available for the support of EPO grants represents about 2% of the currently available Chandra Cycle 8 grants budget.

1.5 Cancellation of the CfP

The CXC reserves the right to make no awards under this CfP and to cancel this CfP. The CXC, the Smithsonian Institution, and NASA assume no liability for canceling the CfP or for anyone's failure to receive notification of this cancellation.

1.6 What's New in Cycle 8

1.6.1 What's New in NASA's Education Program

Version 3.0, March 2004 of the Explanatory Guide to the NASA Office of Space Science Education & Public Outreach Evaluation Criteria has been finalized and released. This document should be carefully studied for its explanations of the NASA EPO criteria and indicators of alignment with the criteria. This document is available from the Chandra EPO Proposal page (<http://chandra.harvard.edu/edu/proposals/epo.html>).

1.6.2 What's New in Chandra Cycle 8

We repeat the following information from last year's CfP. Following the intent of the revised NASA indicators of alignment, we require that proposals involving on-going programs, where funding is being requested to continue a program previously funded through Chandra or other NASA EPO funding, show clear evidence of the effectiveness of the program. A separate section has been added under the section for "evaluation" which must be filled out for proposals to which this requirement applies. Basic information about the previously funded grants is requested in the background information section for the PI.

1.7 Proposal Submission

EPO proposals must be submitted both electronically, via the on-line Chandra proposal forms, and as hardcopy. The proposal forms will be available on-line through the Proposer page at cxc.harvard.edu and as a link from this document, see Section 4.2.

In addition to the electronic submission of the EPO proposal, an original hardcopy of the proposal with authorized institutional signature, and two

additional copies, must be received by the SAO Grant Awards Section by 4 p.m. EDT on 25 October 2006. Originals of signed hardcopies of letters attesting to partnerships or collaboration should be attached. Letters may contain significant detail about the partner's role and are not limited to one page. Other supporting information that cannot be entered into the proposal form may be attached. If you have questions or concerns about the appropriateness of material that you wish to attach in hard copy, please call the CXC EPO Coordinator. Both the electronic and hard copy of the proposal must be identical in terms of the material entered into the proposal software. If they are not identical, the proposal will be deemed to be non-responsive. Late Proposals will not be considered. We recommend submission well before the deadline to avoid possible last minute problems.

Hardcopies should be submitted to:
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory
Grant Awards Section
100 Acorn Park Drive, MS 22
Cambridge, MA 02140-2301

2. Proposal Submission Policies

2.1 Who May Propose

Participation in this supplemental education grant program is open only to U.S.-based Principal Investigators whose scientific Chandra proposal has been selected in Stage 1. Non-U.S. Investigators are not eligible to submit a supplemental EPO proposal. EPO funding may not be requested for projects or activities taking place in non-U.S. venues or addressing non-U.S. audiences, or for expenditures supporting non-U.S. recipients.

The U.S. is defined as the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Each individual EPO proposal must have one, and only one, Principal Investigator (PI). Each institutional or team EPO proposal must designate one, and only one, PI as the Lead for the proposal. The PI is responsible for the programmatic and administrative conduct of the project, and is the formal contact for all communications with the CXC. Questions or issues about the proposal submission will be directed to the PI.

An eligible PI may submit a separate EPO proposal for each of his or her science proposals accepted in Stage 1. A PI may submit individual proposals, join an institutional or team proposal, or divide proposal opportunities among the three. However, for more than one EPO proposal from a given PI to be accepted for funding, the proposals must be for different programs or activities.

2.2 Proposal Confidentiality

Proposals submitted to the SAO will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by the review process. For proposals that are selected to receive funding, an abstract, and names and contact information for key participants (e.g. PI, EPO Co-I, and any education partners) will become publicly accessible.

3. Chandra Cycle 8 EPO Proposal Guidelines

3.1 Applicable General Policies, Guidelines and Procedures

The two key documents that establish the basic policies and guidance for all EPO activities funded by SMD are a strategic plan entitled "Partners in Education: A Strategy for Integrating Education and Public Outreach Into NASA's Space Science Programs", (March 1995), and an implementation plan, entitled "Implementing the Office of Space Science (OSS) Education/Public Outreach Strategy", (October 1996). Both of these documents may be obtained on-line at <http://science.hq.nasa.gov/research/epo.htm>, or in hardcopy from Dr. Larry Cooper, Science Mission Directorate, NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC 02546-0001.

The following overall policies and guidelines apply to the EPO activities proposed for supplementary funding to a Chandra research grant:

- The proposed EPO activity is expected to have a general intellectual linkage to the science objectives of the research proposal and/or the science expertise of its PI and/or the science goals of the Chandra mission.
- Programs of educational or public information merit that could by the nature of their content be funded by other agencies may be declined for funding. Programs are expected to include significant NASA/SMD science, math, engineering, and/or technology content.
- EPO programs funded through SMD are required to make a valuable contribution to K-14 education, to public outreach to enhance public understanding of science, and/or to enhance participation of underserved/underutilized groups and women in science that is consistent with NASA education and public outreach goals and objectives.
- NASA requests (but does not require) that the submitting organization waive PI labor costs and its customary overhead charges on an EPO budget, since in many cases such activities will directly aid a local educational or public science institution, and the budget available for this EPO program is extremely limited.
- At least one of the science team members **MUST** be directly involved in planning, implementing, oversight, and execution of the proposed EPO program or activity. In the case of institutional or team proposals, it is expected that more than one team member will be involved. This also is meant to preclude proposals that serve only to "pass through" money to an external organization or individual who would then carry out the proposed

EPO activity. Such a situation is inconsistent with the intention of SMD that the research community be actively involved in education and public outreach.

- Although the PI of the parent research proposal must be designated as the PI of the supplementary EPO proposal, and must maintain involvement with the proposal program or activity as described in this CfP, an additional qualified person may be identified as the EPO Co-I. This person may be responsible for conducting the EPO activities. The EPO Co-I might be, for example, an appropriately qualified colleague from the PI's science team, or institution, or from a partnering educational or science outreach institution.
- Active involvement of appropriate and qualified education or outreach partners is required. Given the smaller funding scale of these supplemental grants, EPO partners can make significant contributions to a proposed program.
- Proposals for EPO supplements to research grants will be reviewed by panels of qualified science, outreach, and education professionals in accordance with the evaluation criteria outlined below (see Section 3.2). The substance of these reviews will be conveyed to the proposers in a summary report.

3.2 EPO Evaluation Criteria

There are three categories of evaluation criteria against which EPO activities proposed for this Chandra Cycle 8 opportunity will be evaluated. Although creativity and innovation are certainly encouraged, note that none of these sets of criteria concerns the originality of the proposed effort.

The three areas of evaluation criteria are 1) Intrinsic Merit; 2) Relevance to NASA's Objectives; and 3) Cost. Each category is further described through the eight sub-factors below. Note that the failure of a proposal to be highly rated in any one of these three categories is sufficient cause for funding to be declined.

3.2.1 Intrinsic Merit

The category Intrinsic Merit will be evaluated against the following four sub-factors:

Sub-factor 1: The Quality, Scope, Realism, and Appropriateness of the Proposed EPO Program

- general intellectual linkage to the science objectives of the parent research proposal, the PI's science expertise and/or the Chandra mission science goals
- clear organization, consistent with requested budget
- clear lines of management responsibilities
- demonstration of high probability for successful implementation

Sub-factor 2: Customer-Needs Focus

The program has been designed to respond to a need identified by the education community, a science outreach organization or program, or other relevant public information program, organization, or audience sector.

Note that letters attesting to identified "customer-needs" may be attached to the hardcopy that is submitted with institutional signature.

Sub-factor 3: Partnerships/Leverage/Sustainability

- Program achieves high leverage and/or sustainability through intrinsic design or
- Program achieves high leverage and/or sustainability through the involvement of appropriate local, regional, and/or national partners in design, development, and dissemination.
- Active involvement of one or more members of the science team is required
- Active involvement of appropriate and qualified partners is required

Note that signed letters attesting to partnerships should be attached to the hardcopy that is submitted with institutional signature.

Sub-factor 4: The Appropriateness of Evaluation Plans

- Evaluation plans document the program outcomes
- Evaluation plans demonstrate progress toward achieving the objectives of the proposed education/outreach activities
- Scale and methodology of evaluation plans are appropriate to the proposed program
- For proposals requesting funds to continue an on-going program previously funded by NASA or Chandra EPO grants, evidence of program outcomes and/or demonstration of progress toward achieving the objectives of the previous activities or program must be shown.

3.2.2 Relevance to NASA Objectives

3.2.2.1. Background Notes

(1) Overall guidelines for this category:

- Any program that includes a formal education component must show alignment of that component with appropriate education standards.
- All proposals must be responsive to sub-factor 5.
- Proposals must also be responsive to at least ONE of sub-factors 6 or 7.

(2) Note that definitions and explanations for this section (below) have been modified for clarity and appropriateness for the Chandra Cycle 8 EPO CfP.

Version 3, March 2004 of the Explanatory Guide appears to imply that all proposals must be responsive to both of sub-factors 6 and 7. In light of the statement in that same document that scope of proposals should be appropriate to funding, we have chosen to clarify this area by requiring that only one sub-factor be addressed. While both sub-factors are of high interest to NASA, it may be difficult to address both within the scope of the modest funding available through this grant opportunity. You are encouraged to structure a program with both broad application and specifically targeted impact. However, as NASA has stated previously, a genuine and thorough compliance with one of sub-factors 6 or 7 is preferable to an unrealistic attempt to respond to both. A high score on more than one sub-factor may increase this category's rating, but addressing only one well, if that is the most appropriate approach for the proposed program, will not penalize it. Two mediocre scores will not outrank one high score.

(3) Alignment with education standards

Proposals that focus on formal education (including curriculum, remedial or after school programs, or educator enrichment or professional development workshops) must demonstrate substantive and informed alignment with appropriate education standards.

Note that this requirement can apply in two ways:

1. The focus of the proposed activity may be the development and implementation of a formal education program (e.g., curriculum materials, student or educator workshops), which must demonstrate alignment with appropriate education standards. The education program and its alignment with standards should be described under sub-factors 6 or 7, whichever is more appropriate.
2. The main thrust of the proposed program may be an outreach or an informal education program, but if any aspect of the program can be considered a formal education component as defined above (e.g. workshops for students or educators that accompany a museum display), that component must demonstrate alignment with appropriate education standards and should be described and placed in context under sub-factor 6 or 7.

3.2.2.2 The category Relevance to NASA Objectives will be evaluated against the following three sub-factors.

Sub-factor 5: Content (applies to all proposals)

The degree to which the proposed program makes direct use of NASA content, people, or facilities to involve educators, students, and/or the public in NASA Science, Technology, Engineering, or Mathematics (STEM)

Sub-factor 6: Pipeline

The degree to which, through the use of NASA space science, programs, or products, the proposed program makes a demonstrable contribution to attracting diverse populations to careers in STEM.

Note that acceptable response to this sub-factor can cover a large range of program options from outreach or informal programs that meet the NASA goals of inspiration and excitement (such as talks, museum displays and programs, planetarium shows, multi-media products, etc.) to programs specifically addressing career education, to programs addressing informal or formal education (targeting students and/or teachers) in STEM.

Note that the requirement of this sub-factor is to show broad inclusion of diverse populations, either through specific inclusionary steps, choice of partnerships, demographics of probable participants, or other indicators. The proposal should demonstrate that it is reasonable to expect that diverse groups will be included in the audience reached by the activity, as opposed to showing the targeting of specific, more narrowly identified audiences required by sub-factor 7.

Note that alignment with appropriate education standards must be demonstrated for any Formal education programs or program components.

Sub-factor 7: Diversity

The degree to which, and specific steps through which, the proposed program reaches identified, targeted groups, contributing to the involvement, broad understanding, and/or training of underserved/underutilized groups in NASA related space science and technology. Alignment with appropriate education standards must be demonstrated for any Formal education programs or program components.

3.2.3 Cost

Sub-factor 8: Resource Utilization

The adequacy, appropriateness, and realism of the proposed budget including demonstration of effective use of funds.

3.2.4 Further Information about Evaluation Criteria

NASA has developed a document, entitled "Explanatory Guide to NASA Office of Space Science Education and Public Outreach Evaluation Criteria" to provide additional detailed information for proposers who submit a supplemental EPO proposal.

You are most strongly urged to study the Explanatory Guide while developing your EPO program and writing your proposal. However, note that while the Guide is most useful in conveying the broad NASA education context, it applies to a wide range of NASA proposal opportunities, many of which can, by the nature of

the funding program (mission AOs, Long Term research grants) provide an opportunity to propose very ambitious programs. The Chandra grants are funded at more modest levels. Therefore, the sub-factors that are more appropriate to programs of higher funding and thus broader, more ambitious scope have been modified for purposes of this Chandra supplemental CfP. The explanation of evaluation sub-factors 1-5, and the budget sub-factor (8) are interpreted identically as described in the "Explanatory Guide". Sub-factors 6 and 7 have been modified in this CfP; for these sub-factors, the Guide should be used only for broader context and for general clarification of the criteria. Otherwise, the modifications in this CfP prevail.

3.3 More Information about Proposal Budget Guidelines

EPO budgets will be evaluated as an integral part of the EPO proposal and will be judged against sub-factor 8 of the EPO proposal Criteria. It is important that all contributions of education partners or other collaborators be clearly detailed.

3.3.1 Input to Proposal Forms

Discussion of the budget and costs associated with the proposed EPO program are required in three places in the proposal form:

- A total figure for the proposal budget is asked for in the Background Information section.
- A narrative justification of the budget's appropriateness and reasonableness is asked for in the Program Description and Detailed Budget Justification section, under the response to Sub-factor 8.
- A detailed budget and budget explanation are asked for in the Budget Form.

Budget details (e.g. categories of expense, dollars) should be consistent among the three forms.

All budget information is to be submitted electronically using the on-line proposal formats. Additional budget forms specific to the PI's institution that are attached in hardcopy will not be considered by the committee.

3.3.2 Content

The detailed Budget Justification should include a breakdown of the work assignments including task description, labor-hours or labor-months, salary, and fringe benefits (as appropriate) for all persons funded by this proposal (whether direct labor, subcontract, or consultant); identification and justification of any major supply or equipment purchases (see Computers or Workstations, below); and a detailed list of expenses categorized as "Other" Overhead costs to be waived should be clearly identified. Proposal budgets not containing the above-described budget detail will receive lower scores as a result of providing insufficient information.

3.3.3 Profit

While proposals from Investigators working at For-Profit Organizations are eligible for funding, profit is unallowable; however, Management Fees of up to 3% may be permitted on a case-by-case basis.

3.3.4 Computers or Workstations

Requests for computers or workstations must be justified in the Budget Justification. Computers or workstations are not allowable as a direct cost unless specifically justified. Any computer or workstation purchase requested to be made as a direct charge under this award must include a description of the equipment, an explanation of how it will be used in the conduct of the proposed education activity and why it cannot be purchased with indirect funds, and a statement certifying that the equipment will be used exclusively for the proposed education activity and not for any other use including general business or administrative purposes. The budget justification should briefly describe the computing capabilities that exist or are expected to exist at the proposer's institution or at the venue of the education activity (i.e., school, museum, etc.) during the period in which the proposed activity would be performed and then explain the impact to the proposed work if the request for the workstation is denied. The budget request for workstations must be clearly stated on the Budget Form as a line item under "equipment".

3.4 Proposal Evaluation and Selection

During the peer review, EPO proposals are judged against each of the 3 categories of sub-factors as outlined above. Each sub-factor is evaluated individually and assigned a rating. Ratings for the sub-factors are totaled to produce a rating for each of the three categories, and the three categories are totaled to provide an overall rating for the proposal. Proposals are recommended for selection according to their overall ratings. However, failure of a proposal to be highly rated in any one of the evaluation categories is sufficient cause for the EPO proposal to be declined for funding. The CXC reserves the right to offer selections at a reduced level of cost in order to fit within the program constraints. Proposers to this program should further understand that the lack of monetary resources is sufficient grounds for not selecting a proposal even though it may have been judged to be of high merit.

4. Proposal Submission

4.1 Overview and Schedule of Process

Announcement of the selection of Stage 1 proposals is estimated to take place during July 2006.

4.2 Proposal Content and Format

Both the electronic submission and the hardcopy of the EPO proposal must include:

- Cover Page Form (with institutional signature on hardcopy);
- Detailed Budget Form; and
- Program Description & Detailed Budget Justification in response to the 8 evaluation criteria sub-factors.

Optional (attach to hardcopy):

- Letters attesting to customer/audience need (see Sub-factor 2)
- Letters of commitment or partnership (see Sub-factor 3)

Where applicable, character limits are listed in Table 4.1. The EPO proposal must be submitted electronically (see Section 4.3 for proposal submission instructions). The forms must be completed in the requested format. Any letters supporting customer/audience needs or commitments or partnerships with educational or science outreach institutions or organizations or other necessary supporting material that cannot be entered into the proposal form may be attached to the hardcopy of the proposal. Such materials will be provided to the peer review panel.

Table 4.1: Character limits (including spaces between words)
(If a section exceeds its assigned length, it will automatically be truncated at the character limit when entered into the database.)

<u>Section</u>	<u>Character limit</u>
Abstract	3000
Response to sub-factors 1-8	3000 characters each

All proposal text must be in English.

4.3 Access to Proposal Forms

The EPO proposal forms may be accessed via the EPO proposer page at <http://cxc.harvard.edu/>. Choose the EPO option. Chandra EPO proposal forms can be accessed directly through the World Wide Web (WWW) at: <http://chandra.harvard.edu/edu/proposals/epo.html> .

4.4 Electronic Submission Process

All EPO proposals are required to be submitted electronically according to the instructions given below. Electronic submission facilitates efficient proposal processing and reduces the likelihood of transcription error in the various

databases. Proposers who do not have access to electronic communications should call the Chandra EPO Office, (617) 496-0924.

On submission, you will receive an e-mail acknowledgement of successful receipt of your proposal.

5. Grant Award

The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) is under contract to NASA to operate the CXC, and therefore CXC grants will be issued and administered by the SAO Grant Awards Section. EPO grants will be placed under the same grant award number as the Cycle 8 parent science proposal.

Those EPO proposers selected for award by the CXC will be notified of the recommended funding level for their proposal. New budgets will not be required to be submitted when the amount approved for funding is within twenty percent (20%) of the proposed amount. Awards to winning proposers will be implemented through the issuance of grants. No awards will be funded by the contract mechanism. Awards to NASA Centers (including JPL) and other U.S. Government institutions will be made directly by NASA via an interagency transfer of funds.

Following selection and notification, the CXC will communicate formally only with the PI, or, in the event that the PI is unavailable, the CXC will communicate with the person identified in the proposal as the EPO Co-I. It will be the PI's responsibility to respond to any questions concerning the content or implementation of the proposed education program.

Chandra EPO grants will be issued at the beginning of Cycle 8, and spending against the grant may commence as soon as both SAO and the Recipient Institution have signed the grant. For awards where there is a successful Stage 2 Cost Proposal, EPO funds are added to and issued under the same Grant Award that resulted from the Stage 2 cost proposal review. The science portion of the Grant Award will be added via an amendment to the Grant Award after the data from the initial observation has been distributed to the PI.

A copy of the Award will go to the PI cited in the approved proposal, with the original Award documents sent via overnight courier to the Recipient Institution. All grants will be administered in accordance with the Terms and Conditions for CXC Observing Program Awards (see <http://cfa-www.harvard.edu/cfa/sp/grants.htm> for the Terms and Conditions currently being used for Cycle 7; the Terms and Conditions for Cycle 8 will be posted at a later date).

The period of performance for EPO awards is restricted to not exceed that of its parent research award. A one-year, no-cost extension of the parent grant is generally available upon request to the SAO Grants Awards Section.

6. Reporting Requirements

At the end of FY 2007 fiscal year (30 September 2007), EPO grant recipients will be required to submit a report to the NASA Education Evaluation Information System at the following address: <https://ehb2.gsfc.nasa.gov/edcats/>. Reporting instructions will be sent to PIs under separate cover when EDCATS opens to accept FY 2007 data.

In addition, a final report must be submitted to the CXC that summarizes the education activities or programs carried out under the grant. The report should note any outstanding accomplishments or awards received, should include a copy of any portable or printed products, and should include the URL for any public website associated with the activities or program. The original final report should be sent to the Chandra EPO Coordinator at the address given in Section 7.2. One additional copy of the final report should be sent to the SAO Grant Awards Section at the address shown in 1.7 above.

7. How to Get Help

7.1 Proposal Submission

Technical questions concerning proposal submission may be addressed to the CXC EPO Help Desk at: http://chandra.harvard.edu/epo_helpdesk or by e-mail to epohelp@cfa.harvard.edu .

7.2 Cycle 8 CfP

All other questions concerning this EPO CfP opportunity should be addressed to the CXC EPO office. The full contact information for the CXC EPO Office is:

Chandra EPO Office
Kathleen Lestition, Coordinator
CXC, Mail Stop 6
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory
60 Garden Street
Cambridge, MA 02138-1516
Telephone: (617) 495-7399
FAX: (617) 495-7356
E-mail: klestition@cfa.harvard.edu

7.3 SMD EPO Program

Questions, comments, and suggestions about the SMD EPO program are welcomed and may be directed to either:

Dr. Hashima Hasan (telephone: 202-358-0692; E-mail: hhasan@nasa.gov)

or

Dr. Larry Cooper (telephone: 202-358-1531; E-mail: Larry.P.Cooper@nasa.gov).