

2026 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Physics

Report Run Date: 05/15/2026 02:05:24 PM

1. Department or Agency National Science Foundation
2. Fiscal Year 2026
3. Committee or Subcommittee Proposal Review Panel for Physics
3b. GSA Committee No. 1208

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year? No
5. Current Charter 06/28/2024
6. Expected Renewal Date 06/28/2026
7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year? No
8b. Specific Termination Authority
8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year Continue
10a. Legislation Req to Terminate? No
10b. Legislation Pending? Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Agency Authority
12. Specific Establishment Authority ADM IV-100
13. Effective Date 08/16/1990
14. Committee Type Continuing
14c. Presidential? No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00

18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.00	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

Panels were held to review proposals in all the programmatic areas supported by the Physics Division. The program areas included Elementary Particle Physics, Particle Astrophysics, Plasma Physics, Nuclear Physics, Gravitational Physics, Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics, Physics of Living Systems, Quantum Information Science, and Integrative Activities in Physics. Special emphasis panels were also held to review proposals received through the Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) solicitation, and both the preliminary proposals and then invited full proposals in response to the Physics Frontiers Centers solicitation. Site visit

reviews were held by several programs to provide additional in-depth reviews of complex proposals. Site Visit reviews were also conducted to review ongoing progress or major milestones for Physics Frontiers Centers and other Centers supported by the Division, as well as selected midscale projects and Facilities. These reviews provide important input and advice to the NSF concerning these centers and projects and are critical to the oversight of these complex activities.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The membership of all review panels was selected to include individuals with scientific expertise in physics research, familiarity with the training process for young scientists, and, in the case of the technical reviews, advanced technical expertise in areas of construction, environmental impact, safety, and project management. Members were also selected to have a broad range of experience and viewpoints, including a mixture of junior and senior scientists, a variety of large and small institutions, and a geographical distribution from across the Nation.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The Division of Physics has deadline dates for each of the program areas and conducts at least one panel review a year per program upon receipt of proposals in the Division. In addition, at least one panel is generally convened each year for the REU and any other NSF-wide initiatives being held within that fiscal year.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

Proposals submitted to the Division programs, as

well as those reviewed as part of NSF-wide activities, typically represent complex projects that require a broad range of expertise in physics research and education that no one person has. In addition, panel review in combination with mail review is used to provide better judgment regarding the merits of a proposal. Site visits constitute the most critical component of oversight of large-scale projects such as centers and facilities operations, which by their very nature require a breadth of input to reliably cover all aspects of the activity.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Proposals include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data, such as salaries, and personal information about individuals associated with the proposals. Closing a meeting maintains this confidentiality.

21. Remarks

None

Designated Federal Officer

Michael Cavagnero Deputy Division Director

Narrative Description

The NSF mission is set out in the NSF Act of 1950 authorizes and directs the Agency to initiate and support: basic scientific research and research fundamental to the engineering process; and science and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields of science and engineering. The involvement of knowledgeable peers from outside the Foundation in the review of proposals is the keystone of NSF's proposal review system. Their judgments of the extents to which proposals address the merit review criteria are

vital for informing NSF staff and influencing funding recommendations.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
Improvements to health or safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Outcome Comments

NA

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cost Savings Comments

The use of panelists to review proposals for the Agency is an invaluable asset. The cost of obtaining the expertise, insight, and information received by the Division using alternative methods, such as hiring the expertise as full or part-time employees, would be extremely high.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

697

Number of Recommendations Comments

This is the approximate number of recommendations made in FY2025.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

100%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The word implement is not applicable to grant review panels. All recommendations are considered by the agency.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Not applicable. Please see answer directly above.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

Although panelists may not receive direct feedback, each committee member may use the NSF Fastlane, a public web-based program, which provides information on awards made by the agency to determine the outcome of proposals reviewed by panel.

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

- Reorganized Priorities
- Reallocated resources
- Issued new regulation
- Proposed legislation

Approved grants or other payments



Other



Action Comments

NA

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval 626

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval

212

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval

\$118,483,900

Grant Review Comments

The panelists/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall rating. The number of proposals above include pre-proposals submitted to NSF for review. The pre-proposals are not included in the number of grants recommend or dollar value of grants recommended for approval.

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO



Online Agency Web Site



Online Committee Web Site



Online GSA FACA Web Site



Publications



Other



Access Comments

N/A