



Second-Chance Mentoring

The NSF ATE Program encourages prospective grantees to rework and resubmit proposals that were declined (not funded) when initially submitted. Mentor-Connect supports this proposal re-submission process by offering Second-Chance Mentoring.

Eligible colleges include: (1) those whose first proposal to the Small Grants for Institutions New to ATE was declined, and (2) those who successfully completed a Small Grants for Institutions New to ATE project and subsequently submitted a proposal for a full ATE Project that was declined. This service will be available at no cost to the colleges accepted for Second-Chance Mentoring by Mentor Connect.

Applications may be submitted via email to mentor-connect@fdtc.edu at any time within two years after the date on which a proposal was declined. Please attach the application and the responses to questions 9 and 10, and enter Second-Chance New-to-ATE or Second-Chance ATE Project in the subject line.

Mentor-Connect will provide mentoring by email and telephone conferences for proposals that meet the following criteria:

- The purpose of the original proposal must still be valid and it must remain essentially the same in the revised proposal.
- The college administration must be willing to resubmit the proposal.
- The PI, a Co-PI or another person who was included as senior personnel on the declined proposal must serve as the PI of the revised proposal.
- The proposal must have received reviewer ratings that are mainly “Good” or higher.
- The college must provide an assigned Mentor-Connect mentor with a copy of the proposal as originally submitted and the reviewer comments generated during the proposal review process that are provided by NSF.
- The revised proposal must be submitted within two years of the declined submission.

Mentoring for reworking/resubmitting a proposal will consist of up to ten hours of support from a mentor who will:

- Study the declined proposal and the reviewer comments.
- Discuss proposed revisions with the PI, Co-PIs and grant writer.
- Be available for questions by phone and email.
- Review two drafts of the revised proposal and provide comments by email or telephone conference.
- Review the submission-ready proposal, no later than two weeks before the deadline, and provide comments by email or telephone conference.

Those receiving mentoring services will be expected to fully participate in evaluation of this activity, including providing Mentor-Connect with copies of the new proposal and panel reviews and participating in surveys and/or individual interviews.



Second-Chance Mentoring Application

1. Name and address of the institution:

Name Institution

Address

City State Zip code

2. Name of the project:

3. Disciplinary focus:

4. ATE program to which the proposal was submitted (Check one)

Small Grants for Institutions New to ATE

ATE Projects

5. Name, email and phone numbers (including cell) of PI, Co-PIs and grant writer of the revised proposal:

6. Date in which proposal was declined:

7. Name, email and phone numbers (including cell) of PI and grant writer of the declined proposal, if different:

8. An explanation of any changes in senior personnel:

9. A written response from the PI, in a separate document, to each of the questions below. The response to each question has a 250 word limit.

- What were the review panel's main reasons for declining the proposal?
- What is your opinion of what needs to be done to make the proposal more competitive and fundable?
- Why is the proposed project still important and relevant?

10. Attachments (electronic):

- A complete copy of the declined proposal, including the Project Summary
- Reviews from the NSF Program Officer and all Peer Reviewers
- A statement from a college administrator supporting the resubmission

Written responses from the PI can be typed on the subsequent pages. Remember responses to each question has a 250 word limit.

What were the review panel's main reasons for declining the proposal?

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to type their response to the question above. The box occupies most of the page below the question.

What is your opinion of what needs to be done to make the proposal more competitive and fundable?

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to provide their opinion on what needs to be done to make the proposal more competitive and fundable. The box is currently blank.

Why is the proposed project still important and relevant?

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the user to provide a written response to the question above. The box is vertically oriented and occupies most of the page's width and height.