
ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment Award

Proposal Deadline(s) (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

October 10, 2022

IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND REVISION NOTES

Important Information

The solicitation has been significantly updated since fiscal year 2022. Proposers are encouraged to read this solicitation carefully to ensure their application is complete and eligible.

REVISION NOTES

- This revised solicitation, proposal selection process, and funding tracks have been adapted to act as a development and preparation opportunity for proposers. This solicitation utilizes a solicitation format, submission documentation requirements, and review processes similar to that of typical the National Science Foundation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Program Requirements

- I. **Introduction**
- II. **Program Description**
- III. **Award Information**
- IV. **Eligibility Information**
- V. **Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions**
 - A. [Proposal Preparation Instructions](#)
 - B. [Budgetary Information](#)
 - C. [Due Dates](#)
 - D. [Research.gov/Grants.gov Requirements](#)
- VI. **Proposal Processing and Review Procedures**
 - A. [Merit Review Principles and Criteria](#)
 - B. [Review and Selection Process](#)
- VII. **Award Administration Information**
 - A. [Notification of the Award](#)
 - B. [Award Conditions](#)
 - C. [Reporting Requirements](#)
- VIII. **Agency Contacts**
- IX. **Other Information**

I. INTRODUCTION

In 2016, the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) formally awarded its first recipients of the ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment Award. Since that time, annual awards have been made of increasing total award amount as related to the return on the Endowments investment.

The ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment Award is used in accordance with donor intent and for the highest foreseeable impact on developing arctic science, and engineering programs, and related activities at UAA.

1. The funds will be used in a systematic way to develop students, programs, and research, which can then have a continuing impact on arctic science, and engineering research without continued support from the Endowment.
2. (While acknowledging the possibility for wide ranging participants and programs and that research is not provincial,) Alaska students, communities, projects, and opportunities will be given top priority.
3. Endowment recipients will be required to provide an annual assessment and presentation of project progress and outcomes. On rare occasions extensions of project timelines may be approved by the committee if satisfactory progress is demonstrated.
4. In order to reduce overhead and administrative work, new endeavors will utilize existing infrastructure and programs to the greatest extent possible.
5. All programs funded by the endowment will reflect the role of ConocoPhillips in the program title (e.g. The ConocoPhillips Undergraduate Research Award, The ConocoPhillips Arctic Engineering Fellowship, etc.). Further, all products of activity funded by the Endowment will state appreciation for ConocoPhillips funding.

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

To successfully address the donor intent of the ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment, proposals are required to embody the five items indicated in I. Introduction (especially 1, 2, and 4) and within the Arctic Science or Engineering discipline areas. Additionally, it is highly advised that due to the nature of subsequent external funding opportunities and UAA's strategic goals, it is highly encouraged to:

- Create a project that incorporates traditional interdisciplinary research, researchers may come together with their own disciplinary expertise and skills to address questions of interest that cross disciplinary boundaries, but largely remain focused on their individual research approaches. Further, extending this concept agencies like the National Science foundation take this approach further using the concept of convergence science. Whereas, researchers from traditionally distinct disciplines come together at the onset of project creation to jointly form research questions, novel methodologies, and innovative theoretical approaches; and
- embody the trajectory of UAA as described in the current strategic plan.

This solicitation requests proposals that fall within four proposal submission tracks: Reviewer Grant, Application Development Grant, Research/Scholarship Grant, and Academic Enhancement/Development Grant

Reviewer Grant: This opportunity prepares new proposers for the proposal review process and allow experts to provide their technical insights into proposed projects,

Under this track, this solicitation calls for letters of intent and biosketches from faculty or staff interested in providing a merit review for Research/Scholarship Grant and Academic Enhancement/Development Grant proposals. If selected, you commit to serving on a review committee during Fall 2022, which will include reviewing 3 – 10 proposals, discussing your reviews with the committee, and providing a written summary of your comments for each proposal. Your participation will be compensated by the provision of \$500 that you will be able to use to enable your preparation for a future application to this endowment, an external award, or request as a reviewer award. funding must be spent on tangible and justifiable expenditures (e.g. labor, supplies, travel, etc.).

Application Development Grant: This opportunity provides funding to develop an idea to make it suitable for subsequent submission to future calls for this and other solicitations.

Under this track, this solicitation calls for a short proposal that requests funding that will provide you the means to develop your proposal idea. Under this track, you will be given six (6) months beginning in January 2023 to utilize \$5,000 to develop and ground your research/scholarship idea in preparation for a submission to fiscal year 2024 ConocoPhillips Arctic Science & Engineering Endowment Solicitation. Proposals in this track must clearly delineate what successful completion of the award is and provide this documentation as a final product. Examples include but are not limited to, a 1-page white paper, a quad-chart, and/or similar pitch paper that is peer-improved and trial hardened as described in your proposal as well as a solid draft of an upcoming proposal.

Research/Scholarship Grant: This opportunity provides funding to explore Arctic Science, and Engineering topics, create new knowledge for dissemination, and create a robust foundation for future proposals

Under this track, the solicitation calls for a full proposal that embodies Arctic Science, and Engineering that uses the funds in a manner that develops students, research, and scholarship at UAA. The proposed work must act as the initiation on a research or scholarly activity that does not require continued support of the ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment after the defined project period. The project period and funding maximum are defined in the III. Award Information. Awards up to a maximum of \$125,000 and 2 years in duration are acceptable.

Academic Enhancement/Development Grant: This opportunity provides funding to UAA educators to strengthen, enhance, and expand our offerings in Arctic Science, and Engineering programs.

Under this track, the solicitation calls for a full proposal that embodies Arctic Science, and Engineering that uses the funds in a manner that develops students and programs at UAA. The proposed work must act as the initiation or development of a programmatic innovation or improvement that does not require continued support of the ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment after the defined project period. Note that all new programs or changes to programs that would require approval of the Undergraduate Academic Board or Graduate Academic Board require approval to propose from the proposing units Dean and UAA Provost. The project

period and funding maximum are defined in the III. Award Information. Awards up to a maximum of \$125,000 and 2 years in duration are acceptable.

III. AWARD INFORMATION

Funding:

- **Reviewer Grant**, total award of \$500.
- **Application Development Grant**, total award of \$5,000 and a maximum duration of 6 months.
- **Research/Scholarship Grant**, total award of up to \$125,000 and a maximum duration of 2 years.
- **Academic Enhancement/Development Grant**, total award of up to \$125,000 and a maximum duration of 2 years.

Project durations and budgets must be commensurate with the scope of the work proposed, and with guidance provided elsewhere in this solicitation regarding anticipated program resources. UAA anticipates a portfolio of awards with a range of budgets and durations up to these maxima.

Estimated program budget, number of awards, and average award size/duration are subject to the availability of funds.

IV. ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

Who May Serve as PI:

Current UAA Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty, Research Term Faculty, and Staff (with PI exemption approval)

Term instructors and adjunct faculty may be eligible on a case-by-case basis with pre-approval by their supervisor and College Dean

Students are not eligible to apply directly but may be explicitly named in a proposal.

Limit on Number of Proposals per PI or co-PI:

One application per PI per project type and PI cannot have another actively funded ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment Grant (excluding Reviewer Grant).

V. PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

A. Proposal Preparation Instructions

Review Grant Preparation Instructions:

Prepare and submit in a single PDF:

1. a brief (not to exceed 1 page) letter of expertise and willingness to serve signed by the submitter and their Dean/Director.

2. a 2-page biosketch formatted according to the requirements of a federal sponsor of a future opportunity (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, etc.)

Full Proposal Preparation Instructions:

Cover Sheet and Certification (Provided Template)

Complete the provided coversheet using the provided template.

Proposal Title: For submission of a collaborative proposal from multiple organizations, the title must begin "Reviewer Grant: Last name, First name", "Application Development:", "Research/Scholarship:", or "Academic Enhancement/Development:".

Project Summary (1 page)

Each proposal must contain a summary of the proposed project not more than one page in length. The Project Summary consists of an overview, a statement on the intellectual merit of the proposed activity, and a statement on the broader impacts of the proposed activity.

The overview includes a description of the activity that would result if the proposal were funded and a statement of objectives and methods to be employed. The statement on intellectual merit should describe the potential of the proposed activity to advance knowledge. The statement on broader impacts should describe the potential of the proposed activity to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

The Project Summary should be informative to other persons working in the same or related fields, and, insofar as possible, understandable to a broad audience within the scientific and/or engineering domain. It should not be an abstract of the proposal.

Note: A Project Summary is not required when submitting an Application Development proposal.

Project Description (5 pages)

Note: The Project Description is limited to two (2) pages submitting an Application Development proposal.

The Project Description should provide a clear statement of the work to be undertaken and must include the objectives for the period of the proposed work and expected significance; the relationship of this work to the present state of knowledge in the field, as well as to work in progress by the PI under other support.

The Project Description should outline the general plan of work, including the broad design of activities to be undertaken, and, where appropriate, provide a clear description of experimental methods and procedures. Proposers should address what they want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified. These issues apply to both the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions.

The Project Description also must contain, as a separate section within the narrative, a section labeled "Broader Impacts". This section should provide a discussion of the broader impacts of the proposed activities. Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to the project. The advancement of scientific and/or engineering knowledge and activities that contribute to the achievement of societally relevant outcomes is valued in this section. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and underrepresented minorities; improved education and educator development at any level; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive workforce; increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others; improved national security; increased economic competitiveness of the U.S.; use of science and technology to inform public policy; and enhanced infrastructure for research and education. These examples of societally relevant outcomes should not be considered either comprehensive or prescriptive. Proposers may include appropriate outcomes not covered by these examples.

Results from Prior ConocoPhillips Arctic Science & Engineering Endowment Support (5 pages)

The purpose of this section is to assist reviewers in assessing the quality of prior work conducted with prior or ConocoPhillips Arctic Science & Engineering Endowment funding. If **any PI or co-PI** identified on the proposal has received prior endowment support including:

- an award with an end date in the past five years; or
- any current funding, including any no cost extensions,

information on the award is required **for each PI and co-PI**, regardless of whether the support was directly related to the proposal or not. In cases where the PI or any co-PI has received more than one award (excluding amendments to existing awards), they need report at least one award that is most closely related to the proposal.

The following information must be provided:

(a) the title of the project;

(b) amount and period of support;

(c) a summary of the results of the completed work, including accomplishments, supported by the award. The results must be separately described under two distinct headings: Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts;

(d) a listing of the publications resulting from the endowment award (a complete bibliographic citation for each publication must be provided either in this section or in the References Cited section of the proposal); if none, state "No publications were produced under this award."

(e) evidence of research products and their availability, including, but not limited to: data, publications, samples, physical collections, software, and models, as described in any Data Management Plan; and

(f) a listing of proposals and awards (e.g. grants, contracts, etc.) that were the direct result of the prior funding. Listing should include at a minimum; proposal/award title, sponsor, amount, period of

performance, and a list of faculty, staff, and students that are to work on or had worked on the award.

References Cited (No page limit)

Reference information is required. Each reference must include the names of all authors (in the same sequence in which they appear in the publication), the article and journal title, book title, volume number, page numbers, and year of publication. If the proposer has a website address readily available, that information should be included in the citation. It is not the intent, however, to place an undue burden on proposers to search for the URL of every referenced publication. Therefore, inclusion of a website address is optional.

Proposers must be especially careful to follow accepted scholarly practices in providing citations for source materials relied upon when preparing any section of the proposal. While there is no established page limitation for the references, this section must include bibliographic citations only and must not be used to provide parenthetical information outside of the Project Description.

Biographical Sketch(es) (2 pages maximum for PI, Co-PI, and Senior Personnel)

A two (2) page biographical sketch is required for the PI, Co-PI, and all Senior Personnel. While specific format is not defined, proposers are advised to select a format that is relevant to their current and future proposals such as those defined by NSF, NIH, DOE or other funders. Proposers are advised to consider use of ORCID and ScienCV to assist in develop their biosketches.

Budget and Budget Justification (2 page maximum)

Proposers are directed to use the UAA Office of Sponsored Programs templates for Budget and Budget Justification. These can be found at the following link:

https://drive.google.com/drive/u/2/folders/1k8u4yPzL5wurNefpsf_qwhVs2Oe8p2rl

It is highly advised to prepare the budget template for inclusion in the proposal by hiding all unnecessary and unused cells retaining only the subtotal rows for reference.

Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources (no page limit)

This section of the proposal is used to assess the adequacy of the resources available to perform the effort proposed to satisfy both the Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts review criteria. Proposers should describe only those resources that are directly applicable. Proposers should include an aggregated description of the internal and external resources (both physical and personnel) that the organization and its collaborators will provide to the project, should it be funded. Such information must be provided in this section, in lieu of other parts of the proposal (e.g., Budget Justification, Project Description). The description should be narrative in nature and must not include any quantifiable financial information. Reviewers will evaluate the information during the merit review process and the cognizant Program Officer will review it for programmatic and technical sufficiency.

If it appears that this document is written in a manner to extend the page limit of the proposal, the document will not be evaluated beyond acknowledgement of availability of facilities, equipment, and other resources.

Letters of Collaboration

The Project Description must fully detail any substantial collaborations and engagements (included or not included in the budget) with partner organizations. Letters of Collaboration should be provided in the Supplementary Documents section of the proposal and consist of the following statement unless the collaborating organization needs to explain in more details the nature of their collaboration. Letters of Collaboration that appear to be written in a manner to extend the proposal page limit of the proposal will not be evaluated beyond acknowledgement of collaboration.

"If the proposal submitted by [insert the full name of the Principal Investigator] entitled [insert the proposal title] is selected for funding by UAA, it is my intent to collaborate and/or commit resources as detailed in the Project Description or the Facilities, Equipment and Other Resources section of the proposal."

Note: No letters of support will be accepted for any proposal types included in this submission.

B. Budgetary Information

Cost Sharing:

Inclusion of voluntary committed cost sharing is prohibited.

Budget Preparation Instructions:

Proposers are directed to use the UAA Office of Sponsored Programs templates for Budget and Budget Justification. These can be found at the following link:

https://drive.google.com/drive/u/2/folders/1k8u4yPzL5wurNefpsf_qwhVs2Oe8p2rl

Proposals are expected to include students at any academic level in a significant manner. Financial compensation of students is expected.

Faculty salary is anticipated only at a level required to mentor, advise, and guide students. Summer salary requests more than two weeks per year will be heavily scrutinized. Faculty may consider course buy-outs if necessary, with adequate justification and College approval. Compensation of an individual faculty/staff shall NOT exceed 160 hours during the project period and no more than 240 hours for participating faculty/staff in aggregate.

C. Due Dates

- **Full Proposal Deadline(s)** (due by 5 p.m. submitter's local time):

October 10, 2022

D. Submission Requirements

Proposals must be submitted via email in a single PDF and include an editable OSP Budget Spreadsheet in Microsoft Excel file to uaa_OR+CPASEE@alaska.edu.

Principle Investigators MUST work with their units assigned Sponsored Programs Administration Services (SPAS) representative to ensure their budget meets University requirements. To ensure adequate time for review, submit your proposal to SPAS no later

than 5 business days prior than any unit deadlines that your department/unit/college may implement. Review by SPAS is not required for Reviewer Grant.

VI. PROPOSAL PROCESSING AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Proposals received by uaa_OR+CPASEE@alaska.edu are acknowledged and, if they meet proposal requirements, assigned for review. All proposals are carefully reviewed by a scientist, engineer, or educator serving as an Agency Contacts, and usually by three to five other persons as *ad hoc* reviewers, panelists, or both, who are knowledgeable in the particular fields represented by the proposal. These reviewers are selected by the Agency Point of Contact charged with oversight of the review process. Care is taken to ensure that reviewers have no or are able to minimize conflicts of interest with the proposal. In addition,

The review process will follow a process that strives for similarity to that of the National Science Foundation whereas a comprehensive description of the Foundation's merit review process is available on the NSF website at: https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/.

A. Merit Review Principles and Criteria

To identify which projects to support, the Agency Contacts rely on a merit review process that incorporates consideration of both the technical aspects of a proposed project and its potential to contribute more broadly to meeting the donor's intent and advancing UAA's strategic objectives. The Agency Contacts will make every effort to conduct a fair, competitive, transparent merit review process for the selection of projects.

1. Merit Review Principles

These principles are to be given due diligence by PIs and organizations when preparing proposals and managing projects, by reviewers when reading and evaluating proposals, and by Agency Contacts when determining whether or not to recommend proposals for funding and while overseeing awards. To assist in future applications and because of the broad applicability, the Agency Contacts have adopted adaptations NSF principles with the understanding that this funding is to support excellence in research and education, the following three principles apply:

- All projects should be of the highest quality and have the potential to advance, if not transform, the frontiers of knowledge.
- These projects, in the aggregate, should contribute more broadly to achieving societal goals as related to donor intent. These "Broader Impacts" may be accomplished through the research itself, through activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. The project activities may be based on previously established and/or innovative methods and approaches, but in either case must be well justified.
- Meaningful assessment and evaluation of funded projects should be based on appropriate metrics, keeping in mind the likely correlation between the effect of broader impacts and the resources provided to implement projects. If the size of the activity is limited, evaluation of that activity in isolation is not likely to be meaningful. Thus, assessing the effectiveness of these activities may best be done at a higher, more aggregated, level than the individual project.

With respect to the third principle, even if assessment of Broader Impacts outcomes for particular projects is done at an aggregated level, PIs are expected to be accountable for carrying out the

activities described in the funded project. Thus, individual projects should include clearly stated goals, specific descriptions of the activities that the PI intends to do, and a plan in place to document the outputs of those activities.

These three merit review principles provide the basis for the merit review criteria, as well as a context within which the users of the criteria can better understand their intent.

2. Merit Review Criteria

All proposals are evaluated through use of the two merit review criteria.

The two merit review criteria are listed below. **Both** criteria are to be given **full consideration** during the review and decision-making processes; each criterion is necessary but neither, by itself, is sufficient. Therefore, proposers must fully address both criteria.

When evaluating proposals, reviewers will be asked to consider what the proposers want to do, why they want to do it, how they plan to do it, how they will know if they succeed, and what benefits could accrue if the project is successful. These issues apply both to the technical aspects of the proposal and the way in which the project may make broader contributions. To that end, reviewers will be asked to evaluate all proposals against two criteria:

- **Intellectual Merit:** The Intellectual Merit criterion encompasses the potential to advance knowledge; and
- **Broader Impacts:** The Broader Impacts criterion encompasses the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes.

The following elements should be considered in the review for both criteria:

1. What is the potential for the proposed activity to
 - a. Advance knowledge and understanding within its own field or across different fields (Intellectual Merit); and
 - b. Benefit society or advance desired societal outcomes (Broader Impacts)?
2. To what extent do the proposed activities suggest and explore creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts?
3. Is the plan for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? Does the plan incorporate a mechanism to assess success?
4. How well qualified is the individual, team, or organization to conduct the proposed activities?
5. Are there adequate resources available to the PI (either at the home organization or through collaborations) to carry out the proposed activities?

Broader impacts may be accomplished through the research itself, through the activities that are directly related to specific research projects, or through activities that are supported by, but are complementary to, the project. Such outcomes include, but are not limited to: full participation of women, persons with disabilities, and other underrepresented groups; improved education and educator development at any level; increased public scientific literacy and public engagement with science and technology; improved well-being of individuals in society; development of a diverse, globally competitive workforce; increased partnerships between academia, industry, and others; improved national security; increased economic competitiveness of the United States; and enhanced infrastructure for research and education.

Additional Solicitation Specific Review Criteria

- Proposals will also be carefully reviewed and ensured that they meet donor intent.
- Proposals will be reviewed for alignment with UAA strategic objectives.
- Proposals of early career faculty will be given preference.

B. Review and Selection Process

Proposals submitted in response to this program solicitation will be reviewed by Ad hoc Review and/or Panel Review.

Reviewers will be asked to evaluate proposals using two merit review criteria and, if applicable, additional program specific criteria. A summary rating and accompanying narrative will generally be completed and submitted by each reviewer and/or panel. The Agency Contacts assigned to manage the proposal's review will consider the advice of reviewers and will formulate a recommendation for funding to the Endowment signature authority.

Once an award or declination decision has been made, Principal Investigators are provided feedback about their proposals. In all cases, reviews are treated as confidential documents. Verbatim copies of reviews, excluding the names of the reviewers or any reviewer-identifying information, are sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Director by the Agency Contacts. In addition, the proposer will receive an explanation of the decision to award or decline funding.

VII. AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

A. Notification of the Award

Notification of the award is made to PI and Dean by the Agency Contacts.

B. Award Conditions

Annual Meeting

To ensure donor awareness of endowment activities, at least one representative from each active and recently ended award are expected to attend and prepare accordingly for an annual meeting. Preparation for the meeting may include but is not limited to preparation of a poster, video recording, or live presentation. Details of the annual meeting will be provided prior to the event with adequate time to allow the project teams to prepare.

Communication, Coordination, and Engagement with Arctic Communities

In accordance with the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (IARPC) [*Principles for Conducting Research in the Arctic*](#), proposers planning projects working near Arctic communities are strongly encouraged to discuss the proposed work with those communities while the project is being developed and throughout the research period, as appropriate. Researchers should coordinate their field activities with nearby communities and are expected to share results with the community following each field season and/or at the end of the project. Investigators should include travel funds for this in their proposal budget. Some projects may require discussion with Indigenous or subsistence co-management organizations. Time for dialogue should be included in the project

schedule and funds for these meetings, both in person and virtual, should be included in the proposal budget.

Acknowledgement of Support

Grantees will be required to include appropriate acknowledgment of the University of Alaska Anchorage ConocoPhillips Arctic Science & Engineering Endowment in any publication (including World Wide Web pages) of any material based on or developed under the award, in the following terms:

"This material is based upon work supported by the University of Alaska Anchorage ConocoPhillips Arctic Science & Engineering Endowment."

Grantees also will be required to orally acknowledge the endowment support using the language specified above during all news media interviews, including popular media such as radio, television, and news magazines.

C. Reporting Requirements

For all grants multi-year grants, the Principal Investigator must submit an annual 2 page project report to the Agency Contacts no later than 90 days prior to the end of each year.

For all grants, no later than 120 days following expiration of a grant, the PI also is required to submit a final project outcomes report.

Failure to provide the required annual or final project outcomes report, will delay review and processing of any pending proposals for all identified PIs and co-PIs on a given award.

Such reports provide information on accomplishments, project participants (individual and organizational), publications, and other specific products and impacts of the project. The project outcomes serve as a brief summary, prepared specifically for the public, of the nature and outcomes of the project.

VIII. AGENCY CONTACTS (e.g. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT)

Please note that the following information is current at the time of publishing.

Primary Point of Contact - Aaron Dotson, Vice Chancellor, Research – adotson@alaska.edu

Denise Runge, Provost – drunge@alaska.edu

Jenny McNulty, Dean of College of Arts & Sciences - jmcnulty2@alaska.edu

Kenrick Mock, Dean of College of Engineering – kjmock@alaska.edu

Jayna Combs, Senior Development Officer – jcombs6@alaska.edu

IX. OTHER INFORMATION

Section not utilized at this time.

ABOUT THE CONOCOPHILLIPS ENDOWMENT

ConocoPhillips made a \$15 million pledge to the University of Alaska Anchorage in 2008. The funding included \$4 million toward the construction of the Integrated Science Building and \$11 million to establish the ConocoPhillips Arctic Science, and Engineering Endowment. Because of ConocoPhillips generous gift the building was named the ConocoPhillips Integrated Science Building.

- On February 2, 2008 ConocoPhillips Alaska President Jim Bowles signed the Gift Pledge agreement.
- On April 29, 2008 – The Gift Agreement was signed by ConocoPhillips Alaska President, Jim Bowles and UA President, Mark Hamilton.
 - Donor intent language from agreement– To provide current income and long term support for arctic science, and engineering programs and related activities at the University of Alaska Anchorage as determined by the President of the University of Alaska.

PRIVACY ACT AND PUBLIC BURDEN STATEMENTS

The information on proposal forms will be used in connection with the selection of qualified proposals; and project reports submitted by awardees will be used for program evaluation. The information requested may be disclosed to qualified reviewers and staff assistants as part of the proposal review process; to proposer grantees to provide or obtain data regarding the proposal review process, award decisions, or the administration of awards; to experts, volunteers and researchers and educators as necessary to complete assigned work. Information about Principal Investigators may be added to the Reviewer file and used to select potential candidates to serve as peer reviewers or advisory committee members.
