

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Physics

Report Run Date: 04/28/2021 06:42:07 PM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 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

06/29/2020

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/29/2022

### 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 Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 0

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. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$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 and Nuclear Astrophysics, Nuclear Physics, Gravitational Physics, Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics, Quantum Information Science, Plasma Physics, Physics of Living Systems, Theoretical Physics, Physics at the Information Frontier, and Integrative Activities in Physics. In addition to the programmatic proposals reviewed by the panels, special emphasis panels were also held to review proposals received through the NSF-wide initiatives of Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) and the Physics Frontiers Centers (PFC) programs. Site Visit reviews were held for the Operations and Maintenance awards for the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO), the National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory (NSCL), and the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) programs, supported by the Division. These site visits and special reviews provide important technical input and advice to the NSF concerning the operations of these large-scale projects and are critical to the oversight of these 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 women and members of under-represented minorities, 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 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**

Jean Cottam Allen 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
- Unable to Determine
- Under \$100,000
- \$100,000 - \$500,000
- \$500,001 - \$1,000,000
- \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000
- \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000
- Over \$10,000,000
- Cost Savings Other

**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?**

775

**Number of Recommendations Comments**

This is the approximate number of recommendations made in FY2020.

**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	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Action Comments**

NA

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

Yes

What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants reviewed for approval	730
What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants recommended for approval	290
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants recommended for approval	\$341,375,697

**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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Online Agency Web Site  
Online Committee Web Site  
Online GSA FACA Web Site  
Publications  
Other

**Access Comments**

N/A