

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences

Report Run Date: 05/02/2021 02:04:02 PM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

1766

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

06/28/2019

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

06/28/2021

### 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

10/01/1993

### 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

No Meetings

### 17b. Closed

0

### 17c. Partially Closed

0

### Other Activities

0

### 17d. Total

0

### 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

<b>18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18d. Total</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.00	0.00

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

The advice of the panel was used for making funding recommendations concerning proposals for the programs housed in the Office of the Assistant Director in the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences directorate. These programs include: Science of Science and Innovation Policy (SciSIP), Science of Science and Innovation Policy (SciSIP) II; Research Experiences for Undergraduates Sites (REU), and SPRF (FR), Broadening Participation;

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

The panels consist of men and women with scientific expertise in all areas served by the various programs, as appropriate. The panels contain representatives from non-profit organizations, small and large universities, and industry. The disciplinary areas cover a broad spectrum of social sciences, as well as industry, international and statistical fields representative of the diversity of the Directorate's responsibility in those areas.

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

This fiscal year we had 5 panel meetings for the purpose of proposal review.

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

No other existing panel could provide the multidisciplinary scientific and educational expertise to NSF.

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

Panel meetings reviewed proposals that include information of a proprietary or confidential nature, including technical information, financial data (such as salaries); and personal information concerning individuals associated with the proposals.

**21. Remarks**

None

**Designated Federal Officer**

Kellina M. Craig-Henderson Deputy Assistant Director, SBE

## 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 extent 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?**

275

**Number of Recommendations Comments**

This is an ongoing committee. Therefore, the number of recommendations produced by the committee is for the fiscal year.

**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 the agency to determine the outcome of proposals reviewed by the 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 <b>Number</b> of grants reviewed for approval	265
What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants recommended for approval	51
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants recommended for approval	\$10,459,813

**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 includes 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