

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Engineering Education and Centers

Report Run Date: 05/10/2021 11:20:32 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

### 2. Fiscal Year

2021

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Proposal Review Panel for Engineering Education and Centers

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

173

### 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

01/02/1991

### 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?**

During FY 2020 Engineering Education and Centers Division (EEC) conducted proposal review panel meetings and site visits. The proposal review panels were comprised of a diverse group of engineers and educators from academia, industry and government. Panelists were selected with particular attention paid to increasing the participation of women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities. The panels reviewed both solicited and unsolicited proposals submitted to the EEC division programs via the National Science Foundation (NSF) FastLane system. The panels reviewed proposals submitted to the Engineering Education, Human Resources Development, and Engineering Research Centers (ERC) programs. The panel discussions provided sound technical advice to EEC program staff. This advice was used to assist the EEC division staff in making final funding recommendation decisions on behalf of the NSF. The panelist's reviews are only one of the factors used by program staff in determining which proposals were recommended for funding. The funding recommendation process is very difficult. In addition to the feedback received from the external peer review process, other factors used in the recommendation process include the total amount of program funds available, prior year funding commitments, a principal investigator's prior award performance, opportunities to leverage other funding sources, the overall portfolio of the program, broader national needs, and general NSF policy.

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

The committee membership includes individuals with scientific, engineering, technology management backgrounds from academe, industry, and government. Consideration was also given to achieving geographic balance and to enhancing representation for women, minority, younger and disabled engineers and educators.

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

Panels are convened periodically throughout the year in response to competitions for new ERCs, Engineering Education, Research Experiences for Undergraduates Initiative (REU), Research Experiences for Teachers Initiative (RET), Nanotechnology Undergraduate Education, or for annual progress reviews for ongoing ERCs, and to review special initiative proposals.

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

While ad hoc mail reviewers can be chosen to give a thorough technical review of a proposal, mail reviewer judgments are normally made about a single proposal viewed in isolation. Panel review in combination with mail review, can, in addition, provide judgments about the comparative merits within a group of proposals or within a single complex, multidisciplinary center.

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

To review proposals that included 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**

Kon-Well Wang 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 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
- 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?**

461

**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?**

0%

**% 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 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><u>Number</u></b> of grants reviewed for approval	460
What is the estimated <b><u>Number</u></b> of grants recommended for approval	104
What is the estimated <b><u>Dollar Value</u></b> of grants recommended for approval	\$248,252,134

**Grant Review Comments**

The panelists/advisory committee members provided information on the merit of the proposal, which includes an overall ratingThe number of proposals above includes pre-proposals submitted to NSF for review. The pre-proposals are not included in the number of "grants recommended" 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