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# Executive Summary

The Community for Advancing Discovery Research in Education (CADRE), the official name of the Discovery Research K-12 (DR K-12) network, is a collaborative effort of three organizations: Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC); Abt Associates Inc. (Abt); and Policy Studies Associates (PSA). Funded by the National Science Foundation in 2008, CADRE provides assistance for projects funded under NSF/EHR/DRL's DR K-12 program. The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute’s Research and Evaluation group provides evaluation services to the project. A comprehensive evaluation plan details the scope of the evaluation, which is designed to address the formative and summative information needs of CADRE partners and the NSF. This report presents the results of one research activity: a web-based survey of participants in the CADRE Fellowship program during the 2011-2012 year.

Begun in 2009, the CADRE Fellowship is a capacity building experience for early career researchers and developers. The program is designed to provide exposure to STEM education research and researchers working beyond the Fellow’s particular project and institution, network with colleagues from across the country, and gain insights into NSF and what it takes to be successful and effective in this work.

The survey, which was administered in August 2012, solicits participants’ feedback on the strengths of the program as well as recommended modifications.

Nine out of ten possible respondents completed the survey, for a 90% response rate.

Key findings are discussed below.

**Expectations and Benefits**

Overall, Fellows anticipated that the experience would offer them the opportunity to grow professionally through a) exposure and access to senior researchers and developers, b) professional development activities, and c) peer relationships with their Fellows cohort. In particular, Fellows were highly interested in participating in the PI meeting. Several of these expectations were exceeded for multiple respondents, and all were met to some degree.

Fellows derived important benefits from participating in the program. More than three-quarters of respondents (78%) indicated that they gained a better perspective on what it means to be a STEM education researcher and a better understanding of NSF funding mechanisms (78%). More than two-thirds of respondents (67%) believe that the Fellowship has strengthened their CV, and more than half of the respondents reported increased confidence to participate in professional conversations (56%) and increased awareness of career opportunities in STEM education research (56%).

**Feedback on Activities and Events**

As in past years, Fellowship events and activities included monthly conference calls, selected webinars (5), a listserv, dedicated space on the CADRE website, and opportunities to participate in the PI meeting. Activities at the PI meeting included the following: a presentation given by a subgroup of Fellows, blogging by some Fellows, participation in the ELL working group, support to the Crossroads sessions, a welcome luncheon, and a Fellows dinner.

CADRE made some changes to the program this year, reflecting feedback from prior cohorts and input from the incoming Fellows. The agenda was more co-designed by CADRE and the Fellows than in the past, and the program was organized by topic area. Four topic areas were explored: Introductions and getting to know one another’s work (Fall 2011); Writing for publication (March – April 2012); Writing a successful proposal to the NSF (May 2012); and, the PI meeting (June 2012).

Fellows appreciated the opportunities afforded through the program and would retain many aspects of the program in the future. Webinars and conference calls generally received positive feedback, and to a great extent, Fellows felt prepared for attendance at the PI meeting. Fellows were particularly enthusiastic about their experiences at the PI meeting, as well as the section on writing successful NSF proposals.

As in past years, Fellows expressed a strong desire to connect with one another and lay the groundwork for long-lasting professional relationships. While the opportunity to network with peers was improved compared to past years, Fellows request still more opportunities to get to know one another and develop connections. Suggestions include face to face meetings, structured paired conversations, and re-sequencing (earlier in the fall) or expanding the sessions devoted to project-sharing between Fellows. Also, a number of Fellows remarked that it is difficult to get to know one another through conference calls, given audio difficulties and the lack of visual cues. One Fellow wrote, for example, “It’s not much of a meeting if you can’t see someone.” Largely, the group suggests that improved technology for these calls (webcam, videoconferencing, photos, better audio) would be beneficial.

With respect to the “Writing for Publication” section of the program, Fellows appreciated the structure of dividing the whole group into two smaller groups (novice and experienced) in order to customize sessions according to their needs and interests. For example, at least one novice Fellow appreciated the realization that they were not the only novice, and members of the experienced group tended to appreciate the peer review process, in terms of being able to give and receive feedback, although in some cases there were challenges in terms of timing (e.g., submission deadlines). Also, members of this group valued the involvement of a PI in their segments, both with respect to the substantive information provided and the PI’s expressed interest in continuing to be available to the Fellows. While the survey provides only a limited set of data, one reasonable interpretation could be that the program could be “tweaked” next year, to ensure that the program offerings align as closely as possible with the experience and needs of the participants (i.e., sufficiently general for the novice group and sufficiently advanced for the experienced group). Some comments suggest that the distinction between the groups needs to be clarified, as some Fellows would have appreciated a “middle ground” group. One respondent suggested that the distinction between novice and experienced be framed in terms of manuscript development rather than actual publication credentials.

Feedback on the “Writing for NSF Funding” section of the program was notably positive. Fellows appreciated the Program Officer’s expertise and appreciated her involvement in their program. They wrote, for example:

“Dr. Vanderputten was so great (as stated earlier)! She was honest and gave us valuable information.”

“Good tips for writing proposals from a veteran”

For this section, suggestions for the future include clearer expectations about how to prepare for the mock review panel, the addition of a hands-on writing component, and information about NSF funding opportunities beyond DR K-12.

Fellows felt sufficiently prepared to attend the PI meeting, and as noted above, participating in the meeting was, for some, the high point of the year. The Fellows who prepared a collaborative presentation found, to a large extent, that the collaborative process was an important opportunity for professional growth. One Fellow wrote, for example, “Great professional growth experience to work with my colleagues through a number of months and stages of our presentation, and finally put it on and get good feedback on our content.” Conversely, at least some Fellows who did not participate in the presentation would have appreciated that opportunity.

Fellows were invited to suggest new activities or events, particularly given that there may not be a PI meeting next year. Several respondents suggested activities that would bring Fellows together in a meaningful way, ranging from other face to face interactions (e.g., a retreat), to sub-groups assigned a specific (perhaps hands-on) task, to participation on review panels, to mentoring (peer mentoring or pairing with a senior researcher). Some Fellows suggested that if there is no PI meeting, face to face interaction could take place earlier in the year.

Additional processes or topics for webinars could include: NSF career opportunities; publication tips; funding opportunities; job search sharing; webinars designed to help Fellows explore the CADRE website, followed by discussion of projects found through the search tool; and, discussion sessions following webinars.

**Increasing Awareness and Understanding of the Program**

Respondents were asked how and where, from their perspective, CADRE should recruit applicants for the program, announce new awardees, and acknowledge Fellows’ completion of the program. Most commonly, Fellows identified PIs, the CADRE website and the NSF website as potentially effective communication channels for sharing Fellows’ achievements with the public. Other suggestions included a certificate to acknowledge Fellowship completion, as well as reliance on a broader media net, including CADRE’s Facebook page, local newspapers, and professional NSF affiliate sites.

**Overall Impact**

Fellows were asked to describe how they think their Fellowship experiences will impact their careers. Respondents reported that they gained confidence from their Fellowship experiences, and that their exposure to career, research, and funding opportunities was significant. Illustrative comments include:

“Being a CADRE Fellow has bolstered my confidence in general and in my ability to be a funded STEMEd researcher. I met so many helpful PIs who pointed me toward colleagues of theirs at the university where I accepted a faculty position.”

“I think that I feel more confident to approach other researchers and faculty members who have similar interests across different domains (science, math, and technology) and engage in dialogue with them. I think this will help my confidence in the long run.”

**Future Involvement**

Some Fellows reported interest in continuing to be involved with the Fellows program. Those who were interested suggested the following options: continued involvement in webinars, listserv discussion and conference calls; the creation of an “All Fellows” listserv (past and current cohorts); and mentoring. The following quotes illustrate the enthusiasm and commitment expressed by several Fellows:

“Although I would prefer to wait until I get a faculty position, I would be happy to chat with a Fellow on a monthly basis.”

“I think it would be great to be assigned someone in a similar career stage. A phone call, exchanging emails, answering questions, encouraging participation etc. Or, if possible face-to-face.”

“I'd be happy to discuss with any Fellows authorship, being a postdoc and study design. This could be in the form of regularly scheduled conference calls, or email conversations, or providing written feedback on manuscripts or study designs.”

# I. Introduction

The Community for Advancing Discovery Research in Education (CADRE), the official name of the Discovery Research K-12 (DR K-12) network, is a collaborative effort of three organizations: Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC); Abt Associates Inc. (Abt); and Policy Studies Associates (PSA). Funded by the National Science Foundation in 2008, CADRE provides assistance for projects funded under NSF/EHR/DRL's DR-K12 program. As described in its Strategic Plan (March, 2009), CADRE’s mission is as follows:

CADRE supports and makes visible NSF’s DR-K12 program and its grantees by building their research capacity; strengthening the development and implementation of resources, models and tools that enhance STEM teaching and learning; and disseminating the program’s collective findings and products. CADRE encourages an active community of learners, working with them to move research and development along the cycle of innovation and effectiveness, and represents the program as a comprehensive body of knowledge, thereby moving forward the goals of NSF.

The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute’s Research and Evaluation group provides evaluation services to the project. A comprehensive evaluation plan details the scope of the evaluation, which is designed to address the formative and summative information needs of CADRE partners and the NSF. This report presents the results of one research activity: a web-based survey of participants in the CADRE Fellowship program during the 2011-2012 year. A description of the Fellowship is adapted from CADRE materials as follows:

The CADRE Fellowship is a capacity building experience for early career researchers and developers. The program is in its third year. The program is designed provide exposure to STEM education research and researchers working beyond the Fellow’s particular project and institution, network with colleagues from across the country, and gain insights into NSF and what it takes to be successful and effective in this work. Fellowship activities include attending the 2012 DR K-12 PI meeting held June13th –15th in Washington, D.C., participating in a series of calls and webinars on topics related to career development, engaging in the focused content of a special interest group or working group, and contributing content to the CADRE web site.

## A. Overview of the 2011 – 2012 Fellowship

As in past years, Fellowship events and activities included monthly conference calls, selected webinars (5), a listserv, dedicated space on the CADRE website, and varied opportunities to participate in the Principal Investigators meeting. Activities at the PI meeting included the following: a presentation given by a subgroup of Fellows, blogging by some Fellows, participation in the ELL working group, support to the Crossroads sessions, a welcome luncheon, and a dinner for Fellows.

CADRE made some changes to the program this year, reflecting feedback from prior cohorts and input from the incoming Fellows. The agenda was more co-designed by CADRE and the Fellows than in the past, and the program was organized by topic area. Four topic areas were explored:

1. Getting to know one another’s work (Fall 2011)
2. Writing for publication (March – April 2012)
3. Writing a successful proposal to the NSF (May 2012)
4. The PI meeting (June 2012).

Please see the Calendar of Activities (Appendix C) for a presentation of the program. Additional details are provided in the body of this report.

The survey solicits participants’ feedback on the strengths of the program as well as recommended modifications.

## B. Organization of the Report and Notes on Style

Survey items have been grouped by category, as shown in the Table of Contents (e.g., Respondents; Fellows’ Expectations; Fellowship Benefits; and Feedback on Activities and Events). For clarity, the Table of Contents is detailed, showing sections and sub-sections of the report. Section headings are indented to provide a sort of roadmap (an outline) to the report and results; for example, under III. D. Feedback on Activities and Events, the reader sees six sub-headings: Introductions; Writing for Publication; Writing a Successful Proposal to the NSF; PI Meeting Preparation and Participation; Other Feedback: Recorded Webinars; Challenges; and Implications. Implications are organized by “Support to professional growth,” Collaborating with other Fellows,” Increasing Awareness and Understanding of the Fellows Program,” “Activities and topics for the future,” “Anticipated impact of the program,” “Future involvement” and “Other comments.”

Responses to closed questions are presented as tables and graphs, with the corresponding survey item text displayed in the heading. Responses to open-ended questions are presented in paragraph and bulleted format. Open-ended responses have been modified for grammar and spelling but are otherwise displayed verbatim, shown between quotation marks.

The text of the initial invitation that was sent by email is attached as Appendix A.

The survey instrument is attached as Appendix B.

The calendar of Fellows’ activities and events is attached at Appendix C.

# II. Methodology

From the time of project start-up, the evaluators have participated in routine project meetings and maintained ongoing communication with the Principal Investigator and the CADRE leadership team, in order to maintain familiarity with the project and to keep abreast of emergent information needs. The survey of the 2011 – 2012 CADRE Fellows was developed through a collaborative process between the evaluation team and the CADRE team. The survey reflects feedback that previous Fellows have provided and feedback that some current Fellows have expressed previously. Specifically, the two previous cohorts (2009 – 2010 and 2010-2011) also completed a feedback survey and, some 2010 – 2011 Fellows participated in a focus group session at the PI meeting in December 2010. Findings from each of these data collection activities informed the development of the current survey.

The survey was posted to a web-based platform (Survey Monkey) and made available from August 8th through August 16th, 2012. Reminders were sent by email to non-responders on August 14th and 15th, 2012.

# III. Results

## A. Respondents

CADRE Fellows from the 2011 – 2012 cohort were invited to participate in the survey. Nine out of ten possible respondents completed the survey, for a response rate of 90%.

## B. Fellows’ Expectations

Fellows had high expectations of the program, including networking with peers, contact with senior researchers, participating in activities for professional development, and attending and participating in the PI meeting.

Upon being awarded the CADRE Fellowship, all respondents (100%) expected the chance to network with their peers, and the opportunity to make contact with senior researchers or mentors. Eight of the respondents (89%) expected access to professional development opportunities, while seven (78%) expected to attend the PI meeting, and six (67%) expected to gain recognition in the field as a result of the Fellowship.
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One respondent added a comment detailing another expectation:

“Giving a presentation at the PI meeting.”

Respondents were also asked to indicate how well the Fellowship had met their expectations for each of the choices they had selected. Results are indicated in the charts below.

Regarding recognition in their fields, four respondents (44%) indicated that their expectations were completely met, two respondents (22%) indicated that their expectations for recognition in their field were exceeded, two respondents (22%) indicated their expectations were met somewhat, while one respondent (11%) indicated that that expectation was not met.
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The majority of respondents (56%) indicated that their expectations of attendance at the PI meeting were exceeded, and the remainder of the respondents indicated that their expectations of attendance at the PI meeting were completely met.
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The opportunity to network with peers was greatly improved compared to last year’s survey. The majority of respondents (56%) indicated that the opportunities provided to network with peers completely met their expectations, while two (22%) indicated that the opportunities exceeded their expectations. Three respondents (33%) indicated that the opportunities somewhat met their expectations.\* Last year, 88% of Fellows reported that the opportunity to network with peers somewhat met their expectations, while only one respondent (12%) reported that this expectation was completely met.

\*Note: one respondent selected both “Somewhat” and “Completely,” resulting in a total of 10 responses.

The majority of respondents (56 %) indicated that the opportunities provided to make contact with senior researchers somewhat met their expectations, as shown below. The remaining responses were evenly split across two other categories: 22% indicated that it completely met their expectations, and 22% that it exceeded their expectations.
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Four respondents (44%) indicated that their expectations for access to professional development activities were met somewhat, and four respondents (44%) indicated that these expectations were met completely.

## 
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## C. Fellowship Benefits

Fellows were asked to indicate what benefits they derived from their Fellowship experience, if any. As shown in the table below, more than three-quarters of Fellows (78%) indicated that they gained a better perspective on what it means to be a STEM education researcher or developer. The same proportion of respondents (78%) indicated that they gained a better understanding of NSF funding mechanisms. More than two-thirds of respondents (67%) believe that the Fellowship has strengthened their CV. Other commonly selected benefits included increased confidence to participate in professional conversations (56%), increased awareness of career opportunities in STEM education research (56%), professional contact with senior researchers or developers (44%), better understanding of other R&D funding options (44%), and name recognition (33%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **What benefits did you receive from being a CADRE Fellow, if any?** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Number of Respondents** | **9** | **100%** |
| Better perspective on what it means to be a STEM Education researcher or developer | 7 | 78% |
| Better understanding of NSF funding mechanisms | 7 | 78% |
| Stronger CV | 6 | 67% |
| Increased confidence to participate in professional conversations | 5 | 56% |
| Increased awareness of career opportunities in STEM education research | 5 | 56% |
| Professional contact with senior researchers or developers in the DR K-12 community | 4 | 44% |
| Better understanding of other R&D funding options | 4 | 44% |
| Name recognition as a result of having been a Fellow | 3 | 33% |

Four respondents offered detailed comments about their Fellowship experiences, reflecting their enthusiasm for the program. A few of these comments point to the value of face to face meetings and interactions, and suggest that in-person meetings be conducted earlier in the year, if possible:

“The Fellows Program was very important to me. I was recognized formally by my university with a press release and this led to a recognition by a local TV station which named me a community champion with a spot on the news about our program. However, this was secondary to the experience of networking and meeting senior researchers. Working on the presentation and 'meeting' people online and in person was tremendous and, hopefully, we will continue to network and keep in touch with each other.”

“The opportunity to attend the PI meeting exceeded my expectations because it was the first time to form lasting bonds with fellow Fellows. We spent 8 months hearing each other and learning more about our respective research projects. The PI meeting allowed us to get to know each other on a personal level. Aside from interacting with the Fellows, the ability to sit in a room with PIs and hear more about their projects and their experiences with NSF and collaborations was illuminating. Access to program officers was a key opportunity as well. I will not feel as apprehensive to approach one in the future.”

“I felt like the opportunity to make contact with senior researchers or mentors happened pretty much exclusively at the PI meeting, which was really good, but I'm wondering if this could have also happened earlier. I also feel like the opportunity to network with peers really clicked around and at the PI meeting. I think that more intensive ‘team building’ or face-to-face [meetings] (if possible) earlier on would have helped with this.”

“There wasn't really that much time given or required for participation in the program, between Oct. and June, so there was a limited amount of expectations that could be fulfilled. The two biggest pieces for me were working with my group of five to prepare our presentation at the PI conference, and then participating in the PI conference itself. Both of these were rewarding activities that I learned a lot through.”

## D. Feedback on Activities and Events

Respondents were asked to provide feedback on each of the events they attended over the course of the year, and each topic section overall. Below, the events are presented chronologically by topic section.

### D.1. Introductions

The initial events in the program were designed to introduce Fellows to one another and to the technologies and tools that they would be using to communicate, collaborate, and learn together over the course of much of the program.

In November, Fellows received a rough calendar of activities and timelines. CADRE established a listserv and a Fellows group space on the CADRE website. Fellows were invited to practice using these virtual tools, and an initial conference call was convened for December 12. The call provided an opportunity for Fellows to meet one another and the CADRE staff, and to hear an overview of the resource network and the DR K-12 program. As shown in the table below, eight Fellows (89%) reported attending this conference call. Of those who attended this call, three (38%) rated it very beneficial, while five (63%) rated it somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conference Call: Introductions and Overview of CADRE**  **(December 12, 2011)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **8** | **89%** |
| Very Beneficial | 3 | 38% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 5 | 63% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Four respondents provided additional comments, reflecting appreciation for the call as well as challenges inherent in all conference calls. Suggestions include providing some visual information, either photos or live webcam streaming:

“Conference calls are a challenging way to be introduced to new individuals. The ability to see others live on a webcam or at least have access to a photo would be very helpful.”

“Hearing only voices for the first time was a bit overwhelming. It took at least 3-4 months before I began to recognize voices.”

“I think it was beneficial in that it provided some groundwork and background into the Fellows program.”

“This was a great opportunity to get to know everyone.”

The next events were designed to help Fellows get to know one another by making presentations on their projects. Fellows presented to one another on January 23, 2012 and February 13, 2012. Discussion, including questions and critique, took place on the day of the presentation and was continued on the listserv, moderated by the presenters. Four of the respondents (44%) found this structure (presentations and listserv discussion) to be very beneficial and four others (44%) found it somewhat beneficial. One respondent (11%) reported that this structure was not at all beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fellows’ Project Presentations (January 23 and February 13, 2012) and Listserv Discussion** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 4 | 44% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 4 | 44% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 1 | 11% |

When asked what benefits the sessions and listserv discussion afforded the Fellows, most responded positively:

“I enjoyed hearing about the variety and range of the projects represented in our group, and the chance to follow up more with each other. Some of the ideas informed my work on my project, and helped me to understand the landscape of DR K-12.”

“I learned that there is a LOT of gaming research going on, and I also learned that few STEMEd researchers understand assessment.”

“It was good to get an idea of what the other Fellows are interested in. It allowed me to get a feel for who I might want to get to know better.”

“To learn about others' projects”

“It was good to get an overview of the interests and work of the other Fellows and to see where there were areas of overlap.”

Even the critiques offered were affirmative of the activity overall: one was a request for more time for the presentations and the other was a suggestion to hold these sessions earlier:

“The format was too brief, and not enough time for a real discussion.”

“This was a nice way to see what everyone was doing. It might be helpful to do this in December.”

The first webinar took place between the two peer research presentations (January 31, 2011). It was designed as an introduction to the CADRE website. As shown in the following table, all respondents (100%) attended this webinar. Nearly all attendees (89%) indicated that this webinar was somewhat beneficial, while one (11%) indicated that it was very beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar: Using the Website (January 31, 2011)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 1 | 11% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 8 | 89% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Four respondents commented on the website webinar:

“Even though I didn't use the website as much as I would have liked, this session helped me navigate so that when I was looking for something, I could find it easily.”

“The best part was learning about the search tool on the website, and the calendar of events.”

“The website is very rich and sometimes not particularly intuitive to use (e.g., the search feature), so this was beneficial. But I wonder if it would have been more efficient to write up some of these things into a set of step-by-step directions and allow Fellows to learn and explore individually?”

“We did not have logins at the time, so we could not play in the sandbox while being shown the features. Being able to login and poke around prior to the meeting would have been much more beneficial.”

Respondents were asked to what extent the listserv and website helped them get to know one another. Six respondents (67%) indicated that these tools helped them to a great extent, while two respondents (22%) reported that they helped to some extent and one respondent (11%) reported that they did not help at all. All of the respondents reported using these tools.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Listserv and Website** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Use** | **9** | **100%** |
| To a great extent | 6 | 67% |
| To some extent | 2 | 22% |
| Not at all | 1 | 11% |
| I did not use these tools. | 0 | 0% |

Two Fellows commented on their differing experiences of these online tools:

“I had a little trouble connecting with others at first, and I felt very separate from the rest of the group. I'm not sure if the listserv and Fellows space helped that much.”

“The listserv was great. However, I will admit that the Fellows space and website was not something I visited very often at all. Maybe 3-4 times during the project. The email and meetings were much more important.”

When asked if the listserv was sufficient for their purposes and how CADRE could better support Fellow’s use of the website, one Fellow had straightforward praise: “The listserv is very helpful and beneficial for me.”

Another Fellow found the listserv to be an ineffective communication tool: “I didn't use the listserv unless I had to. It was one extra place I had to check, and because postings were so infrequent, it was an ineffective communication tool among Fellows.” This individual also reported infrequent use of the CADRE website, although citing appreciation for the search function:

“I was fine not using the website, especially when it did not seem that PIs regularly used it. For example, I am the only group member listed on my PIs page. We have 5 graduate students who are supported on a DR K-12 grant. I appreciated the search tool.”

Another Fellow suggested a Facebook page for the group:

“The listserv was awkward ... not socially awkward, but more like not very user-friendly. In this day of Facebook and such, it would be much easier and effective to have an interface much like social networking sites, where Fellows could get to know each other and collaborate more fluidly.”

Fellows were asked to practice using the website, uploading their bios and other information at the end of this topic section. All nine respondents (100%) affirmed that they did practice using the website. Succinct comments left by two Fellows reveal they had no problems with it:

“It was a relatively straightforward process.”

“Very easy.”

Overall Suggestions: Introductions Section

Respondents were asked how, if at all, this first section of the program could be improved. Two Fellows provided critique and suggestions with regard to mostly technical problems:

“Ongoing issues with conference calls -- often difficult/impossible to understand the person talking. This made it challenging to participate in a meaningful way.”

“Again, making sure the Fellows had logins prior to the webinar.”

Overall, Fellows request more opportunities to get to know one another and develop connections. Suggestions include face to face meetings, paired conversations, improved technology, and re-sequencing of the presentations sessions:

“I think that spending more time on connecting Fellows together would have been beneficial, maybe having some paired get-to-know-you conversations if face-to-face meetings at the beginning [are] not possible?”

“If at all possible, I think it would be nice to have some sort of face to face chat. Often times the audio made it difficult to understand and the feedback was an issue throughout the calls. When our small group met, we used Go to Meeting and it was really nice. I know it is hard with so many, but it really was a great way to collaborate.”

“Group video conferencing would help make the getting-to-know you phase shorter.”

“The technology environment of a phone call, which was used several times during the program, is rather limited. I would strongly suggest some kind of video chat/conference tool where everyone can see each other. This ratchets up engagement and getting to know each other. It's not much of a meeting if you can't see someone. The content of the [Introductions] call wasn't hugely helpful I guess.”

“Again, maybe moving [our presentations] up in the program a little bit.”

### D.2. Writing for Publication

The next topic section of the program focused on writing for peer reviewed journals. All Fellows were first invited to attend a recorded webinar (March-April 2012) on the topic “Tips for Getting Published.” All nine respondents (100%) attended this webinar. Also, Fellows were given, as background reading, the transcript from last year’s Fellows’ discussion of the same topic. As shown in the following table, reactions to the webinar were nearly evenly split between those who found it somewhat beneficial (56%) and very beneficial (44%).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar: Tips for Getting Published (March-April 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 4 | 44% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 5 | 56% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

A couple of Fellows commented, as follows:

“Personally, I did not learn much from this webinar, as I had a few publications from graduate school. I did, however, appreciate reading more about others' research. I never would have thought to find research on computational thinking, for example. Yet, the research has important implications in my field.”

“This was beneficial and the resources were very nice to have. I think in the end, you just do it! I submitted a chapter for a book that was recently accepted and it was just a matter of having the confidence to submit and do it.”

The ten Fellows were then divided into two subgroups: Novice (5) and Experienced (5).[[1]](#footnote-1) Novice Fellows participated in a conference call on manuscript writing with Fellow Jorge Solis, basing their discussion on an article that he had previously submitted for publication but that had been rejected. Experienced Fellows were offered a webinar on publications and presentations with Dr. Jamal Abedi.

The conference call for the novice group (April 5, 2012) was titled, “What to expect when you’re writing a manuscript.” The majority of novice Fellows (60%) found the call very beneficial and the rest (40%) found it somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conference Call: Writing for Publication with Jorge Solis (April 5, 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **5** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 3 | 60% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 40% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

One Fellow suggested that a more general discussion of steps toward publication might be more effective than reviewing an article:

“The presentation by the gentleman (I forget his name, I'm sorry) could have been a bit better. I think perhaps, not having this one with the whole group might make it more beneficial. The article itself was difficult to digest and not necessarily in everyone's field. Maybe talking more in general about publishing and the different steps would be better than reviewing an actual article. We do that all the time with our work and know what an article looks like. My recommendation would be to review the following steps: 1.The structure of an article 2.Finding a journal that matches your project (research, theory, case study) 3.Submitting 4.Rewriting after comments 5.Politics of publishing Just a thought.”

Another Fellow expressed appreciation for the format and the content of the discussion:

“I liked that we used one of our Fellows' expertise to have this discussion, and I took notes that hopefully I'll use someday.”

The webinar provided for the experienced Fellows (April 26, 2012) was titled “Publications and Presentations” and was led by Dr. Jamal Abedi. All four survey respondents (100%) attended this webinar. As shown in the following table, three of the attendees (75%) found this webinar very beneficial, while the other attendee (25%) found it somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar: Publications and Presentations for Experienced Fellows with Dr. Jamal Abedi (April 26, 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **4** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 3 | 75% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 1 | 25% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Comments reflect appreciation for this webinar:

“Dr. Abedi provided a lot of great information that was relevant to my research area. Since my DR K-12 project was heavily focused on assessment, I already had a lot of knowledge. But Dr. Abedi's expertise in the area was tremendously helpful in pushing me to think more critically about my own understandings and practices with assessment. And he was a genuinely nice person!”

“I liked how candid the conversation was. I didn't feel like folks were self-censoring too much.”

“I appreciated Dr. Abedi's presentation, as well as his genuine offer to help in the future. This was an excellent webinar.”

Prior to the webinar with Dr. Abedi, experienced Fellows engaged in a peer review process. They were asked to submit a written piece for peer review and feedback. All four experienced respondents submitted writing to one another. Two respondents (50%) indicated that the peer review process was somewhat beneficial, and two (50%) indicated that it was very beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar preparation: Peer Review Process, Experienced Fellows only (April 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents** | **4** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 2 | 50% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 50% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Fellows’ comments on the peer review process suggest that benefits include the opportunity to give and receive useful feedback, while challenges include the timing of feedback and the degree to which Fellows participated in the review process:

“I did not have a follow-up phone conversation with any of my peers. I feel a phone discussion was [un]necessary. The written comments/feedback were sufficient.”

“I received useful feedback. Unfortunately, the timing was a little bad since my manuscript was in the review process. The manuscript was accepted before I had an opportunity to incorporate some of the recommendations from my peers. I enjoyed reading about different research areas, though.”

“The feedback on my paper wasn't really helpful at all. It came well after the deadline. Having the opportunity to provide feedback was helpful, but I think that was mostly because the manuscript I gave feedback on happened to be in a field I was familiar with, so I got to think a lot about the author’s perspective on a topic I knew about (which was different from my own).”

“We were supposed to receive feedback from two peers; however I only received feedback from one. There was no formal mechanism to ensure that the second review process happened in a timely fashion (or even at all).”

Overall Suggestions: Writing for Publication Section

When asked how, if at all, the Writing for Publication section of the Fellowship could have been improved, members of the novice group commented on the decision to divide all the Fellows into two groups. One Fellow was reassured to know that others shared the same limited base of experience:

“Again, [it] was very beneficial to know that I was not the only one in the novice group. It can be intimidating when people are rattling off publications, but just because you have not had the opportunity does not mean you do not have the capability.”

Two comments from members of the novice group suggest that the delineation of “novice” and “experienced’ was not entirely clear, and that a “middle-ground” group may have been more effective:

“I think it depends on the particular cohort, but I think I would have benefited from a ‘middle-ground’ group.”

“I was sort of in between the novice and experienced group, as I had a paper already in review at the time, but I didn't have a paper ready that was at the same stage as the other ‘experienced’ group. I think that Jorge did a wonderful job describing and exploring the process and provided a great deal of information, especially for someone who may not have had any publishing experience, but I had already been exposed to much of this process.”

One member of the experienced group commented as well on the sub-groups structure, suggesting that the distinction between novice and experienced be framed in terms of manuscript development rather than actual publication credentials:

“I also thought it was a great idea to have the novice and experienced group. I would recommend that ‘experienced’ be framed in the sense that you have a manuscript written but not necessarily have published anywhere. My impression was that all the Fellows in the experienced group had published before”

Two members of the experienced group expressed appreciation for the peer review process:

“I liked the round-robin aspect, and 2 weeks was adequate time to read and provide feedback to each other.

“This was a very time-consuming component. The reviews I received from my peers were extremely helpful, and I hope they found my reviews helpful as well.”

One member of the experienced group suggested that the Writing for Publication section of the Fellowship be modified to reflect a greater focus on writing for funding agencies and to include a hands-on component:

“A greater focus on how to write specifically to funding agencies like NSF. Learning by doing is a good way to do this, and it would be nice to have Fellows try their hand at actually writing some component of a proposal to NSF, for example.”

### D.3. Writing a Successful Proposal to the NSF

The next topic section of the Fellowship focused on writing a successful proposal to the NSF. Activities included a recorded presentation on the topic, independent review of sample proposals and the preparation of comments and feedback, and a webinar (Mock Proposal Review Panel), moderated by NSF program officer Elizabeth VanderPutten.

As shown in the table below, six respondents (60%) indicated they watched the recorded presentation. Of the attendees, four (67%) found it very beneficial, and two (33%) found it somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recorded Presentation: How to Write a Successful NSF Proposal** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **6** | **67%** |
| Very Beneficial | 4 | 67% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 33% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Fellows were then asked to review sample proposals and prepare feedback or comments in advance of the webinar with the NSF Program Officer. Five respondents (56%) reported that they reviewed sample proposals, while only two respondents (22%) reported preparing feedback and/or comments.

All respondents (100%) attended the webinar. Six Fellows (67%) found the webinar very beneficial, two Fellows (22%) found it somewhat beneficial, and one Fellow (11%) found it not at all beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Webinar: Mock NSF Proposal Review Panel (May 24, 2011)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 6 | 67% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 22% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 1 | 11% |

Fellows’ comments express great appreciation for the session:

“Dr. Vanderputten was so great (as stated earlier)! She was honest and gave us valuable information.”

“Good tips for writing proposals from a veteran”

“Writing for a grant is a very different animal and it was important to hear from professionals what the keys are to being successful. Dr. Vanderputten was a great resource!!!! Both in the webinar and at the PI conference.”

One Fellow suggested that information on alternative funding opportunities would also have been useful. Another Fellow appreciated learning about the competitive grant process from a realistic perspective:

“I thought it was very good, and provided a great deal of insight into the process. I think it would have been useful to also get a better sense of the range of different funding opportunities beyond DR K-12.”

“Learning more about the inner workings of NSF and the funding process was depressing, honestly. Depressing but illuminating. I was not aware, for example, that a certain geographical distribution was required. I thought -- erroneously as it turned out -- that the best scored proposals would be funded. The knowledge gleaned from the webinar helped me to understand more why the grant process is so competitive.”

Another Fellow would have appreciated some tips on how to write a successful proposal. This individual would also have taken advantage of the opportunity to ask the Program Officer some questions:

Tips on how to write a successful proposal would have been helpful. I would have liked the opportunity to ask questions (i.e., Should we dive right in and submit a proposal as a PI, or should we have a couple of successful Co-PI experiences under our belts first? What experiences should we highlight in our NSF CV's?)”

As noted above, most Fellows did not prepare feedback and comments for the webinar. Respondents’ comments suggest that Fellows did not understand that they would be expected to discuss the proposals at length; they would have prepared more if the expectation had been clear:

“I was not prepared for this mock proposal format.”

“It was very useful to hear about the grant lines presented by Elizabeth. I was not prepared to present on the proposals she had sent out in the way she expected (I think others on the call felt the same), which made the second half of the call feel very awkward.”

“Had I known we were going to discuss the proposals at the depth we did, I would have been more conscientious about reading them and taking detailed notes. I thought they were examples for us to have and the conversation would be much more general. I still found the webinar quite beneficial.”

Overall Suggestions: Writing a Successful Proposal to the NSF Section

Respondents were asked how this topic section of the Fellowship could be improved. They provided the following feedback and suggestions:

“As I mentioned in my previous response, I think trying your hand at writing a component of a proposal would be great. I recently spoke with a Program Officer for one of NSF's funding programs, and she said that I could submit a 2-3 page concept paper to her so that she could offer comments about how to turn it into a strong full proposal. This level of help is exactly what Fellows would appreciate, I'm sure. If the Fellows program is, in some sense, a mentorship program designed to help potentially promising researchers get funding for strong projects, doing something like this would be incredibly beneficial.”

“Better prep for the call with the Program Officer would have been helpful.”

“I think it was very good, but also I think that providing a list of other funding options through the NSF (I learned about NSF CAREER grants at the PI Meeting) would probably have been helpful.”

“I think this component was great. Perhaps adding panel membership to the Fellows program would be beneficial as a follow-up to the program. Even if it is not funded by CADRE, I think an invitation and participation on a panel would be a GREAT experience!”

### D.4. PI Meeting Preparation and Participation

Multiple events and activities took place in preparation for, and at, the PI meeting in June. Several Fellows were able to present a collaborative session at the meeting, and there were additional opportunities to integrate with the conference by blogging, participating in the ELL working group, and helping facilitate a Crossroads session. Fellows also had the opportunity to meet each other face to face and socialize at a luncheon and dinner held specifically for them at the meeting.

The final conference call of the year (June 7, 2012) was intended to prepare Fellows to participate in the PI meeting. Six respondents (67%) participated in this call. Attendees were evenly split between three respondents (50%) who found it very beneficial and three (50%) who found it somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conference Call: Preparation for PI Meeting (June 7, 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **6** | **67%** |
| Very Beneficial | 3 | 50% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 3 | 50% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

One respondent explained that they missed the call due to a conflict (“I was traveling back from a conference on this day”). Another Fellow appreciated the “general tips” offered during the call (“Gave good general tips, like ‘Don't worry about missing a session - prioritize networking here!’”).

The Fellows’ Welcome Luncheon (June 13, 2012) took place at the PI meeting to recognize the Fellows and bid them welcome. The luncheon also provided the opportunity to socialize and build community with one another. All nine respondents (100%) attended this event. More than three-quarters (78%) of the respondents reported that the event was very beneficial, and the remaining two respondents (22%) reported that the event was somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fellows Welcome Luncheon at PI Meeting (June 13, 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 7 | 78% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 22% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

This was the first in-person meeting for these Fellows, and the responses were generally very positive:

“Enjoyed lunch and the chance to meet everyone in person, get to hear from Elizabeth.”

“It was excellent to meet the Fellows and PIs in person at the beginning of the PI meeting.”

“It was great to put a real person to a name and a set of interests.”

“It was nice to get a chance to meet everyone. I felt Elizabeth's comments were not new, so that part could have been left out.”

“It was wonderful to put a face to all of the voices. Meeting the other PIs and the NSF and CADRE staff was also a great experience. I enjoyed it very much.”

“Meeting the Fellows and PIs was exciting. It was wonderful walking around and seeing familiar faces. My level of comfort would have been greatly diminished had we not had the welcome lunch. Knowing people, I did not feel that I had to stay under my PI’s wings for my first PI meeting.”

Fellows were invited to develop a collaborative presentation for the PI meeting. Four respondents were able to participate in the collaborative session.[[2]](#footnote-2) Of the responding participants, three reported that the collaborative presentation experience was very beneficial and the remaining respondent reported that it was somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Collaborative Presentation at PI Meeting** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **4** | **44%** |
| Very Beneficial | 3 | 75% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 1 | 25% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

One Fellow found the experience of developing and presenting the session to be the most beneficial aspect of the Fellowship:

“This was probably the most beneficial part of the experience. Working with this group throughout the process was great. We are all 'successful' people in our own right and it took a while to navigate the waters and get past that, but once we did, we each found our niche in the group. [One Fellow] was a very good organizer, [another Fellow] made us think about things a bit differently, [and yet another Fellow] and I were the synthesizers, and [yet another Fellow] offered great ideas all around. We became very close and I know I will work with these people again.”

Some Fellows either expressed regret that they had not been able to present, or suggested that presentations should be integrated more fully into the Fellows program in the future:

“There was one session presented by Fellows because their projects very clearly cohered together. I would have liked the opportunity to present as well, but our projects didn't cohere as well. I recognize there were other things to do at the PI meeting, but I would have welcomed the opportunity to present.”

“I think all Fellows should present. Perhaps, forming two working groups from the beginning and making this part of the process [would be good]. I think we did a great job and we got positive feedback. Even if it is just for the experience of presenting, I think doing two Fellows presentations would be great for next year. Projects naturally fall together or can fit in [somehow] together, and planning a talk will lead to greater collaboration and continued work among the fellows.”

One respondent had higher hopes for the presentation:

“It was very challenging coordinating the presentation. Three members of the group seemed too busy to do the things they had agreed to. I also felt the presentation was not well attended, it was mostly our own PIs.”

There were additional opportunities for Fellows to participate in the meeting, including blogging about the PI meeting via the website, participating in the ELL working group, and supporting the Crossroads sessions. Although in each category of activity there were only a few participants, a total of four respondents reported participating in at least one of these opportunities. Overall, responses indicated participants felt the activities they chose were either very beneficial or somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Activities at PI Meeting** | **Blogging** | | **ELL Group** | | **Crossroads** | |
|  | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **2** | **22%** | **1** | **11%** | **1** | **11%** |
| Very Beneficial | 1 | 50% | 1 | 100% | 0 | 0% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 1 | 50% | 0 | 0% | 1 | 100% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |

Blogging was the only activity of these three that elicited comments, which represented two very different experiences:

“[Blogging] helped me think about what the bigger take-aways from the sessions were, and how to talk about them with peers.”

“The technological issues of posting the blogs was frustrating. I approached blogging more like reporting, so I was not as critical as I otherwise might have been.”

The Fellows’ Dinner (June 14, 2012) was an additional opportunity to socialize and build community with one another at the PI meeting. As shown below, all nine respondents (100%) also attended this event. Again, more than three-quarters (78%) of the respondents reported that the event was very beneficial, and the remaining two respondents (22%) reported that the event was somewhat beneficial.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Fellows Dinner at PI Meeting (June 14, 2012)** | | |
|  | **#** | **%** |
| **Respondents Reporting Attendance** | **9** | **100%** |
| Very Beneficial | 7 | 78% |
| Somewhat Beneficial | 2 | 22% |
| Not at All Beneficial | 0 | 0% |

Comments were very positive and stressed the value of socializing:

“Being able to socialize with the Fellows and learn more about them personally was fun. We're a well meshed group of people! Since all of us are at different stages (e.g., moving to faculty positions, applying for faculty positions, thinking about whether to post-doc or apply for jobs), we were able to provide advice and guidance to assist others through a stage we had recently transitioned [through].”

“Good fun, camaraderie, relaxation after our presentation”

“I enjoyed the opportunity to relax with the CADRE Fellows and to just chat about non-work related things.”

“It was great to get to know the other Fellows personally.”

“It was nice to be able to network informally with the other fellows at dinner and Lisa was a blessing throughout the process. She has a very calm demeanor, but she gets things done!”

Overall Suggestions: PI meeting preparation

In response to the question, “How, if at all, could CADRE have better prepared you to participate in the PI meeting,” Fellows stated that they felt sufficiently prepared.

“I thought the one conference call was helpful and sufficient.”

“I think the PI meeting preparation was fine. I felt very comfortable throughout the meeting itself and the experience was very positive.”

“I think CADRE did well in preparing us to participate in the PI meeting.”

One Fellow commented that administrative details could have been made clearer:

“I felt CADRE was receptive to our requests to have an additional meeting earlier than they planned. So, I did not feel unprepared to participate. I should say, though, that it would have been good to know that some of the travel expenses would not have been covered by CADRE. I expected to have the full $1000 to use toward expenses like mileage and food. It would have just been nice to give a heads up to my PI earlier in the process.”

### D.5. Other Feedback: Recorded webinars

Webinars were recorded for those who could not make the scheduled dates; these recordings were made available to Fellows via the CADRE website. When asked if they had accessed these recorded versions, three respondents replied that they had: one Fellow accessed them one time, and two Fellows accessed them more than once. In response to the question, “Should CADRE continue to make recordings of webinars available next year?” six Fellows responded in the affirmative:

“I did not need to access recorded versions, but yes I think they are beneficial.”

“I missed one of the project sessions in the beginning, and I didn't realize this was available. I think it would have been very useful.”

“I never made the time to revisit them since I attended them live. I liked knowing that I had access to them, however.”

“The recordings are very helpful! Even if attending the webinar in person, sometimes we're just overscheduled with project tasks. Having the recordings to go back to is essential!”

“These were great. I could listen at a time convenient for me, and prepare questions freely, which is sometimes difficult during the actual calls because you're focused on trying to follow what's happening and being prepared in case you're asked a question.”

“Yes, CADRE should continue recording.”

### D.6. Challenges

The survey provided a list of challenges that have been identified by earlier cohorts of Fellows. Respondents were asked to indicate which, if any, of these challenges they encountered. As shown in the following graph, four Fellows (67%) indicated that they felt the Fellowship was not widely known or understood. Three Fellows (50%) indicated that they felt a lack of community among Fellows. Lower numbers of Fellows indicated that they felt insufficiently prepared to participate in the PI meeting (17%) and that they had experienced scheduling or time concerns (17%).
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Given the opportunity to comment, one Fellow suggested that the program could be expanded and extended:

“I actually would've preferred more requirements, engagement with the group, and community building. Perhaps it should last two years!”

### D.7. Implications

The following sections present suggestions and reflections on future Fellows programming.

#### Support to Professional Growth

Fellows were asked, “In what ways could CADRE have better supported your professional growth, if at all?” Five options were listed, and Fellows responded as follows: four respondents (44%) felt that more publicity surrounding the Fellowship would have been beneficial, and four respondents (44%) felt that additional community-building activities for Fellows would have been useful. Two Fellows suggested that better assignments (22%) and additional webinars (22%) would have supported their professional growth.
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Two Fellows offered additional comments:

“Provide additional meaningful ways to connect with other Fellows”

“Writing for funding”

#### Collaborating with Other Fellows

Respondents were asked to comment on their experience collaborating with other Fellows. A few respondents reiterated their enthusiasm for the collaborative PI meeting presentation:

“Great professional growth experience to work with my colleagues through a number of months and stages of our presentation, and finally put it on and get good feedback on our content.”

“This was a great experience! The Fellows I worked closely with will be in my ‘contacts’ for a long time!”

“The collaborations were good. I participated in a group presentation with my group of Fellows. It was a diverse group, and even though we had significant differences in our approaches and ideas for the presentation, we were all able to work together productively.”

“One thing I noticed is a divide between gaming researchers and non-gaming researchers. Being able to collaborate on a session perhaps was more advantageous than doing supporting roles at the meeting. Their bonds were formed well before the PI meeting. I would recommend that CADRE diversify the research projects so that all the Fellows have a reasonable likelihood of collaborating on a session next year. The gamers did not make us non-gamers feel like we couldn't contribute to their session, but I didn't feel like opportunities to participate were obvious. As I mentioned before, having Fellows all along the continuum of professional stages was important, particularly at the PI meeting when we were able to interact in the same physical space.”

One Fellow offered a lengthy reflection. The response highlights not only the Fellow’s intense interest in making connections with peers, but also identifies key barriers and suggests modifications to the program. While some of these notions have already been discussed, the quote is presented here in its entirety to preserve the logical links in the Fellow’s thinking:

“I wish there would have been an opportunity to connect with and/or get to know other Fellows on an individual level earlier in the Fellowship. There were several barriers to this: 1) difficulty hearing during the webinars because of background noise, 2) audio-only makes it difficult to engage with individuals (particularly when you don't know them to begin with), 3) too many people on each webinar, 4) not enough time to ask questions, 5) limited opportunity for Fellows to participate in webinars (mostly sit-and-get). The peer-review [process] provided an opportunity to get to know the Fellows we reviewed for to some extent, and those who collaborated on the session at the PI meeting might have connected, [but] I didn’t feel like I had a real sense of who the others Fellows were or how we might support/benefit one another until the PI meeting.... and it was over so fast! Here is one possible way to address some of these issues: Record webinars for Fellows to watch at their convenience (much of the webinars were sit-and-get, so it does not seem to be important that we are all listening at the same time). [Have] Fellows come together to discuss and ask questions about the webinars in smaller groups with a facilitator (or all together sometimes), and use a system that supports video conferencing.”

#### Increasing Awareness and Understanding of the Fellows Program

Two survey questions proved Fellows’ thoughts on how to increase awareness and understanding of the program. First, respondents were asked how they themselves first became aware of the Fellows program. As shown below, the majority of respondents (89%) heard about the program through their PI. One respondent reported having attended the PI meeting the previous year and hearing about the Fellows program there.
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Next, respondents were asked how and where, from their perspective, CADRE should recruit applicants for the program, announce new awardees, and acknowledge Fellows’ completion of the program. Most commonly, Fellows identified the CADRE website and the NSF website as effective communication channels. Other suggestions included working through PIs to recruit applicants, and a certificate to acknowledge Fellowship completion. A broader media net was also mentioned, including CADRE’s Facebook page, local papers, and professional NSF affiliate sites.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **How and Where Should CADRE…** | **Recruit Applicants** | **Announce Awardees** | **Acknowledge Fellowship Completion** |
|  | “The NSF website.” | “CADRE's website and Facebook page” | “A certificate for CV or promotion purposes” |
| “Through the PI's.” | “Local Papers, on the CADRE website and possibly on other professional NSF affiliate sites” | “The NSF website, CADRE website” |
|  | “The NSF website” |  |

#### Activities and Topics for the Future

Fellows were asked to suggest assignments, activities or processes that could be added to the program. Several respondents reiterated a few ideas expressed previously:

“Have all Fellows participate on a panel for the PI meeting.”

“Have the publishing presentation be more about process and less about one specific article or one person's experience.”

“As mentioned before, writing something like a concept paper that Fellows would anticipate turning into a full proposal for funding. Senior level CADRE members could provide feedback, support, and guidance on how to turn the ideas set forth in the concept paper into a strong full proposal.”

“Group video chat, learning about DR K-12 projects beyond what the Fellows are doing.”

One respondent wasn’t sure what could be added and simply replied:

“Not sure!”

Fellows were also asked to suggest conference call or webinar topics that might be useful for future cohorts. Suggestions included the following:

“NSF career opportunities. There were a lot of young Program Officers and that might be something some of the Fellows are interested in. Applying for and getting a job. There were at least 5 Fellows who were looking for faculty appointments and searching for jobs. I spoke with two that got faculty positions and two others that were transitioning to other post-docs. This might be something to offer, even if not applicable to all Fellows.”

“Publication tips”

“Funding opportunities”

“Job search sharing”

One Fellow suggested a webinar designed to encourage Fellows to use the website search tool, which would be useful not only as a way not only to help them get to know one another and their interests, but also as preparation for the PI meeting:

“Perhaps developing a webinar where we have to find a project not related to any Fellow that we would like to learn more about would be useful. During the webinar we [would] each spend 3-5 minutes summarizing the project and why we were interested in learning more about it. Ahead of the PI meeting, knowing at least one project you can seek out PIs and discuss research with would have been beneficial.”

Finally, Fellows were invited to suggest new activities or events that would be engaging for future cohorts, particularly given that there may not be a PI meeting next year. Several respondents suggested activities that would bring Fellows together in a meaningful way, ranging from other face to face interactions to subgroup formations and review panel participation:

“Have a 2-3 day weekend retreat.”

“I think it is crucial for the Fellows to have an opportunity to meet face to face. If there is no PI meeting, perhaps this could occur earlier in the program.”

“I think subgroups of the Fellows should create a project, perhaps a literature review, or a useful bibliography for a topic of common interest. The end of the Fellows project could include group review/presentation of the project.”

“I think that a ‘buddy system’ would be beneficial--both for Fellows (pairing them up) and setting up a Fellow with a ‘senior researcher’ who would probably not be the Fellow's PI. It's always good to get a different perspective. However, I do have to say that it is really too bad that there will be no PI meeting. I felt that this was the most valuable part of the experience.”

“I think adding participation on a review panel would be a great experience in the absence of the PI meeting.”

“There should be some way for Fellows to be able to socialize at both a professional and personal level. These connections can potentially become lifelong fruitful collaborations. The PI meeting was a natural way to have all that happen. So something that would still preserve that level of connection would be good.”

#### Anticipated Impact of the Program

Fellows were asked to describe how they think their Fellowship experiences will impact their careers. Some Fellows said that they gained confidence from their Fellowship experiences:

“Being a CADRE Fellow has bolstered my confidence in general and in my ability to be a funded STEMEd researcher. I met so many helpful PIs who pointed me toward colleagues of theirs at the university where I accepted a faculty position.”

“I think that I feel more confident to approach other researchers and faculty members who have similar interests across different domains (science, math, and technology) and engage in dialogue with them. I think this will help my confidence in the long run.”

“I hope [the Fellowship experience will impact my career]. It has gotten me some recognition at my institution and since I am not mobile, that is good. I am confident in my ability to be counted among those worthy of such an honor and before I was not as sure. So, thank you for that. It was a great experience!”

Several Fellows stated that they valued the exposure to career, research, and funding perspectives:

“It was useful to meet with people who have very different roles in K-12 education research (graduate students, postdocs, project coordinators) and different perspectives. Participating in the CADRE Fellows program broadened my perspectives on the breadth of K-12 projects underway.”

“Just better exposure to the range of projects and types of work that people are doing out there.”

“I am much more motivated to submit a proposal for funding, especially now that I am more familiar with the process.”

Fellows were also asked whether their participation in the Fellowship program had been acknowledged in any of their professional activities to date, such as in job searches or publication processes. Two Fellows said that their participation in the program had not been acknowledged in those ways. Several Fellows chose to list the program on their CVs, or discussed it during job interviews:

“Yes, job searches. Last year I was able to initiate contact with several search chairs regarding my selection, and for this year, the Fellowship is placed prominently on my CV. The search process cycle has just started.”

“Yes, job searches. People asked about it during my interview process.”

“I've added it to my CV. I don't know yet if it will be particularly helpful.”

One Fellow noted coverage in local and institutional press, and another simply said the exposure had been within their department:

“As stated earlier, the Dean has given me some recognition in the college; the university press department did a special press release; and the local TV station did a feature on our grant and on me. As far as publications, it has not come up and I have not been looking for a job. However, when I do, I will include it as a major event.”

“Within my department.”

As another indicator of possible future impact, Fellows were asked if they had followed up with any PIs they might have met at the PI meeting. Two Fellows (22%) reported that they had followed up, while seven Fellows (78%) had not. Fellows commented:

“It is the summer, so it is difficult to judge: some responded right back, while I have not heard back from others.”

“Dr. Vanderputten asked us to participate in a regional conference and hopefully we will have the opportunity to do so.”

“Not yet...but planning to!”

#### Future Involvement

Fellows were asked to identify ways they would like to stay involved with CADRE over the next few years, if resources were made available. As shown in the following table, six Fellows (67%) would be interested in mentoring current Fellows, and six Fellows (67%) would be interested in participating on the website. Four Fellows (44%) would be interested in participating on the listserv and four (44%) would be interested in participating in webinars. Three of the Fellows (33%) would be interested in participating in conference calls.



n = 6

n = 4

n = 3

n = 4

n = 6

One Fellow suggested that an expanded listserv be created, to involve past and current Fellows:

“I wonder if an ‘All Fellows’ listserv would be beneficial to continue the community beyond the one year of the fellowship. Current and former Fellows [could] post questions, job and partnership opportunities, etc. I'm not sure if a separate space on the website that one has to visit would work for this.”

Those who indicated an interest in mentoring were asked to describe how they envision the mentoring relationship and their role. The following reflections were offered:

“Although I would prefer to wait until I get a faculty position, I would be happy to chat with a Fellow on a monthly basis.”

“I think it would be great to be assigned someone in a similar career stage. A phone call, exchanging emails, answering questions, encouraging participation etc. Or, if possible face-to-face.”

“I'd be happy to discuss with any Fellows authorship, being a postdoc and study design. This could be in the form of regularly scheduled conference calls, or email conversations, or providing written feedback on manuscripts or study designs.”

“I'm getting a better handle on publishing! I'd be willing to help newbies learn more about this process.”

“The relationship should either be equal (i.e., both post-docs looking for faculty positions) or unequal where the mentor is ahead of the mentee (e.g., one post-doc looking for jobs and the other just beginning a post-doc, or grad student-post-doc). The pair, or even group of no more than 3, would meet virtually at least once monthly or at shorter intervals depending on the goals for the relationship.”

#### Other Comments

The survey concluded with an opportunity for respondents to provide additional suggestions or comments relative to improving the CADRE Fellowship program. Respondents did not generally offer more comments in addition to the other items on the instrument. Two respondents offered their thanks for the Fellowship experience:

“I have nothing to add beyond what I've already offered. This questionnaire took MUCH longer than 15 minutes to complete!”

“No. Thank you for the experience!”

“Keep it going! Thanks again.”

# Appendix A: Initial Email Invitation

Subject: CADRE Fellows 2011-2012 survey

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Body: | Dear [FirstName] [LastName],  Hello, it’s Greta with the UMass Donahue Institute. As you may know, we are the evaluators for CADRE. I enjoyed meeting you at the PI Meeting and getting to know a little about your work during your year as a Fellow. I hope all continues to go well for you, and I hope our paths cross sometime soon.  You’re receiving this email because we’re soliciting feedback from Fellows as part of the evaluation.  **Please note that this is not an evaluation of the PI meeting—you may well have just recently completed a survey on that—but instead an evaluation of the Fellows program.**  The CADRE team is very interested in your perspectives on the Fellows program. CADRE’s intent is to continue to revise the program so that it is relevant and useful for promising researchers and developers such as yourselves. If you could please take a few minutes to complete the survey, we’d much appreciate it.  As always, responses will be reported in the aggregate so that individuals are not identifiable. The UMass Donahue Institute will have sole access to the data and assumes responsibility for maintaining confidentiality.  We know you’re busy. We estimate completion time to be about 15 minutes. The survey will be available until August 15.   Please click on the link below to begin the survey.   [link]  Thank you in advance for your time and thinking. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at your convenience.   Sincerely,   Greta Shultz  UMass Donahue Institute  [gshultz@donahue.umassp.edu](mailto:gshultz@donahue.umassp.edu)  tel. 413.587.2406 |

# Appendix B: Survey Instrument

2011 -2012 CADRE Fellows Survey

This survey is being conducted by the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute, the external evaluator to the Community for Advancing Discovery Research in Education (CADRE) project.

This survey gathers feedback from the 2011-2012 Fellows. Analysis of survey results will contribute to the CADRE team’s understanding of the quality, relevance, and usefulness of CADRE’s Fellowship activities and events. Survey results will inform the CADRE leadership team’s planning of future Fellowship opportunities.

This survey is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes. It addresses questions relating to:

* Your perspectives on Fellowship activities and support
* Possible improvements to the Fellowship offerings

The survey comprises closed questions and optional open-ended response items. Please feel free to write as much or as little as you like. We know that your time is limited and we appreciate whatever you can do.

Survey responses are **confidential** and submitted directly to the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute. Results will be reported in the aggregate such that individual responses will not be identifiable. The Donahue Institute will manage all aspects of data collection, management, and analysis to ensure confidentiality.

Thank you in advance for your time and attention. I. Overview of Your Experience

1. **What were your expectations after being awarded a CADRE Fellowship?** Please check all that apply.

**** Recognition in my field

**** Opportunity to attend PI meeting

**** Opportunity to network with peers

**** Opportunity to make contact with senior researchers or mentors

**** Access to professional development opportunities (e.g., webinars)

**** Other (please describe)

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **To what extent did the Fellowship meet your expectations in the areas above?**

**a. Recognition in my field**

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded expectations**

**Please explain.** (Optional)

[open]

**b. Opportunity to attend PI meeting**

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded Expectations**

**Please explain**. (Optional)

[open]

**c. Opportunity to network with peers**

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded Expectations**

**Please explain.** (Optional)

[open]

**d. Opportunity to make contact with senior researchers or mentors**

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded Expectations**

**Please explain.** (Optional)

[open]

**e. Access to professional development opportunities (e.g., webinars)**

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded Expectations**

**Please explain. (Optional)**

[open]

**f. Other (please describe)**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

** Not at all  Completely**

** Somewhat  Exceeded Expectations**

**Please explain.** (Optional)

[open]

1. **What benefits did you receive from being a CADRE Fellow, if any?** Please check all that apply.

** Stronger CV**

** Name recognition as a result of having been a Fellow**

** Increased confidence to participate in professional conversations**

** Better perspective on what it means to be a STEM Education researcher or developer**

** Professional contact with senior researchers or developers in the DR K-12 community**

** Better understanding of NSF funding mechanisms**

** Better understanding of other R&D funding options**

** Increased awareness of career opportunities in STEM education research**

** Other (please describe)**

II. Your Perspectives on the Fellows Program Activities and Processes

1. **CADRE is interested in shaping the Fellows program so that the activities and processes are beneficial to the new Fellows. Please comment on the following activities and events:**
   1. **November – December 2011: Getting acquainted**

**A.1. To what extent did the following tools help you get to know your Fellows colleagues: listerv, Fellows space on website?**

** Not at all**

** To some extent**

** To a great extent**

** I did not use these tools.**

**Comment (optional)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**A.2 Conference call (Monday, Dec. 12): “Meet” one another, CADRE support staff, receive overview of CADRE and NSF/DR K-12.**

**Did you participate in this conference call?** **Yes**

 **No [skip]**

**How beneficial was this conference call?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**A.3. How, if at all, could this initial phase of the program (November-December) be improved? [optional]**

* 1. **January – February 2012: Presenting your research study and getting to know one another’s work**

**B.1. Project presentations (2 sessions) and continued discussion on the listserv**

**How beneficial was this structure for you?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**What benefits, if any, did you gain from these 2 sessions and listserv discussion? [Open]**

Comment (optional)\_\_\_\_\_

**B.2. Webinar: Using the Website (January 31, 2012)**

**How beneficial was this webinar? [Select only one response.]**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

 I did not participate in this webinar

Comment (optional)\_\_\_\_\_

**B.3. (February): Practice using the website, uploading your professional information**

**Did you practice using the website and upload your information?**

 Yes

 No

**Would you like to comment on this process?** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**B.4. How, if at all, could this phase of the program (January-February) be improved? [open]**

* 1. **March - April: Writing for Publication**

**C.1. Recorded webinar: “Tips for Getting Published”**

**How beneficial was this webinar? [Select only one response.]**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

 I did not participate in this webinar.

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**C.2. Writing for Publication Subgroups: Novice and Experienced**

[Select only one.]

 I participated in the Novice group [skip to C.3]

 I participated in the Experienced group [skip to C.4.]

 I did not participate in a subgroup. [skip]

**C.3. [Novice] Conference call with Jorge Solis, April 5**

How beneficial was this call?

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial  I did not participate in this call.

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**C.4. [Experienced]**

**Did you submit a written piece for peer review?**

Yes

No [skip]

How beneficial was the peer review process?

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**C.5. [Experienced] Webinar with Jamal Abedi, April 26**

**How beneficial was this webinar? [Select only one response.]**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

 I did not participate in this webinar.

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_

**C.6. [All] How, if at all, could the Writing for Publication component of the program (March - April) be improved? [optional]**

* 1. **May 2012: Writing a Successful Proposal to the NSF**

**D.1. “How to write a successful NSF proposal”: Did you watch this recorded presentation?**

 Yes

 No [skip]

**How beneficial was this presentation?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

Comment [optional]\_\_\_\_\_

**D.2. Did you review sample proposals in advance of the webinar with the NSF Program Officer?**  **Yes**

 **No**

**D.3. Did you prepare feedback and/or comments for the webinar with the NSF Program Officer?**

 **Yes**

 **No**

**D.4. Mock Proposal Review Panel webinar with Elizabeth VanderPutten, NSF Program Officer (May 24)**

**How beneficial was this webinar? [Select only one response.]**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

 I did not participate in this webinar.

Comment (optional)\_\_\_\_\_

**D.5.CADRE prepared recordings of webinars, to be used by Fellows who could not attend the scheduled events. Did you access these recorded versions?**

*[Select only one.]*

Yes, once

Yes, more than once

 No

**D.6. Please comment on how useful these recorded webinars were for you. Should CADRE continue to make recordings of webinars available next year? [open]**

**D.7. [All] How, if at all, could the “Writing a Successful Proposal” component of the program be improved?** [open]

* 1. **June 2012: PI Meeting**

E.1. **PI Meeting Conference Call (June 7):** How to make the most of the meeting, assignments, and meeting logistics

**Did you participate in this conference call?** **Yes**

 **No [skip]**

**How beneficial was this conference call?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**E.2. Fellows Welcome Luncheon at PI Meeting (June 13)**

**Did you attend?**

Yes No [skip]

**If yes, how beneficial was this event?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**E.3. Fellows Dinner (June 14)**

**Did you attend?**

Yes No [skip]

**How beneficial was this event?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

Comment (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**E.4. Fellows’ participation in the PI Meeting**

**E.4.1. Did you blog about the Meeting?**

**Yes**

**No [skip]**

**How beneficial was this experience?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**Comment [open]**

**E.4.2. Did you participate in the ELL working group?**

**Yes**

**No [skip]**

**How beneficial was this experience?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**Comment [open]**

**E.4.3. Did you support Crossroads sessions?**

**Yes**

**No [skip]**

**How beneficial was this experience?**

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

**Comment [open]**

**E.4.4. Fellows collaborative session at the PI Meeting**

**How beneficial was this experience? [*Select only one.]***

 Not at all beneficial Somewhat beneficial  Very beneficial

I did not participate in the session.

**E.4.5. [*All]* Please comment on your experience collaborating with other Fellows—either at the PI meeting, specifically, or throughout the year. Please note any implications for CADRE and/or next year’s Fellows program.**

**E.5. [*All*] How, if at all, could CADRE have better prepared you to participate in the PI meeting? [**open]

**III. Concluding Reflections**

1. **Over the past couple of years, the issues listed below have been raised by CADRE Fellows. What challenges, if any, did you encounter as a CADRE Fellow?** Please check all that apply.

** Lack of community among Fellows**

** Insufficient preparation to participate in PI Meeting**

** Scheduling or time concerns**

** Fellowship program not widely known or understood by a broader community**

** Ineffective or excessive requirements**

** Other (please describe)**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

1. **In what ways could CADRE have better supported your professional growth, if at all?** Please check all that apply**.**

** More publicity surrounding Fellowship**

** Additional community-building activities for Fellows**

** Better assignments**

** Additional conference calls**

** Additional webinars**

** Other (please describe)**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Comments** (optional) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. *We are interested in your thoughts on CADRE’s support to interaction and communication between Fellows.* **Was the listserv sufficient for your purposes? Could CADRE better support Fellows’ use of the website? Other ideas?** [open]

***Awareness of the Fellows program:*** *The next two questions probe your thoughts on how CADRE could increase awareness and understanding of the Fellows program.*

**Q8 How did you first become aware of the Fellows program?**

**** My PI brought it to my attention.

**** A colleague brought it to my attention.

**** I saw an announcement in a CADRE newsletter.

**** I saw it advertised on the CADRE website.

**** Other (please describe)\_\_\_\_\_

**Q9 From your perspective, how and where should CADRE…**

Q9.a **….recruit applicants for the program**? [open]

Q9.b…**announce new awardees**? [open]

Q9.c … **acknowledge Fellows’ completion of the program?** [open]

**10. Thinking about next year’s Fellows program…**

* 1. **What new assignments, activities, or processes, if any, do you think would be interesting or effective to add to the program? [open]**
  2. **What conference calls or webinar topics might be useful for Fellows in future years? [open]**
  3. **It is likely that there will be no PI meeting next year. Given that your Fellows program culminated in the PI meeting, how should the program be reshaped, to ensure that the Fellows experience is valuable for next year’s participants? [open]**

1. **At this point, how do you think your Fellowship experience will impact your career? [open]**
2. **Has your participation in the Fellows program been acknowledged in any of your professional activities to date (e.g., job searches, publications processes)? Please describe.**
3. **Have you followed up with any PIs you met at the PI meeting?**

Yes No [skip]

**13.a [if yes] Could you briefly describe that experience?**

1. **If resources were made available, would you be interested in participating in any of the following offerings next year?**

** Website**

** Listserv**

** Conference Calls**

** Mentoring new Fellows [if not checked, skip]  
 [if yes] How would you envision the mentoring relationship, and your role?**

1. **Do you have any other suggestions or comments on how CADRE can improve the Fellowship experience?** [open]

**Thank you for your time and feedback!**

# Appendix C: Calendar of Activities

**2011-2012 CADRE Fellowship**

**Calendar of Activities**

November 2011-June 2012

**October 28, 2011**- Nominations are due to CADRE.

**November 14, 2011**- All applicants are notified by CADRE.

**November/ December 2011**- Selected Fellows receive a rough calendar of activities and deadlines. Listserv established, Fellows Facebook group set up, and Fellows group on web site established. During this month, Fellows get to know each other and CADRE and practice using virtual tools for collaboration to be utilized throughout the year.

* *Monday, December 12 at 4:00pm:* Conference call, Fellows “meet” each other and CADRE support staff, and receive an overview of CADRE and NSF/DR K-12.

**January/February 2012**- Topic # 1= Presenting your research study/getting to know each other’s work

* *Monday, January 23 at 4:00pm and Monday February 13 at 4:00pm:* Project presentations by Fellows. Questions, critiques, etc. (2 sessions)
* Continued discussion on the listserv moderated by presenters
* *Tuesday, January 31, 2-4pm:* Webinar, *Using the Website*
* Practice using web site, upload bios and other professional information

**Spring 2012**- Informal networking at national research conferences, such as AERA, NARST, and NCTM, depending upon Fellows’ attendance at these events

**March/April 2012**- Topic #2= Writing for Publication

* Watch recorded webinar, *Tips for Getting Published*
* Divide into 2 subgroups: Novice and Experienced
* *Novice*
  + *Thursday, April 5, 12:00-1:00pm:* What to expect when you’re writing a manuscript, conference call with Fellow, Jorge Solis
* *Experienced:*
  + Submit a written piece to be reviewed by group, engage in two rounds of peer review
  + *Thursday, April 26, 1:00-2:00pm:* Publications and Presentations, webinar with Jamal Abedi

**May 2012-** Topic #3= Writing a Successful Proposal to the NSF

* Watch recorded presentation, *How to write a successful NSF proposal*
* Review sample proposals and prepare feedback/comments for webinar
* *Thursday, May 24, 12:00-1:00pm:* Mock Proposal Review Panel, webinar with Elizabeth VanderPutten, NSF Program Officer

**June 2012-** PI Meeting

* *Conference call:* Fellows learn how to make the most of the PI meeting, receive directions for their assignment and logistics for attending the PI meeting (travel arrangements, reimbursement, etc.)
* June 13-15- Fellows attend DR K-12 PI Meeting in Washington, D.C. There are several sessions that are specific to Fellows, including a welcome luncheon and dinner. Fellows are welcome to attend all sessions and SIG meetings.
  + A subgroup of Fellows gave a presentation at the PI meeting. Other Fellows blogged, participated in the ELL working group, and supported the Crossroads Session Series held by John Settlage.

1. Note that the breakdown of the nine survey respondents includes all five Fellows from the novice group and four of the five Fellows from the experienced group. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Five Fellows actually presented this session, but only four of these Fellows responded to the survey. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)