

2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research

Report Run Date: 05/11/2021 07:27:15 PM

1. Department or Agency		2. Fiscal Year	
National Science Foundation		2021	
3. Committee or Subcommittee		3b. GSA Committee No.	
Proposal Review Panel for Materials Research		1203	
4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	06/29/2020	06/29/2022	
8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date	
No			
9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear	10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?	10b. Legislation Pending?	
Continue	No	Not Applicable	
11. Establishment Authority	Agency Authority		
12. Specific Establishment Authority	13. Effective Date	14. Committee Type	14c. Presidential?
ADM IV-100	08/30/1990	Continuing	No
15. Description of Committee	Grant Review Committee		
16a. Total Number of Reports	No Reports for this FiscalYear		
17a. Open Meetings and Dates	17b. Closed	17c. Partially Closed	Other Activities
No Meetings	0	0	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
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?

The Proposal Review Panel in Materials Research evaluates proposals and conducts site visits, and provides written summary recommendations on those proposals. The panels recommendations play a major role in the program staff's decision process to fund or decline competing proposals. The merit review panels and site visits covered a wide range of different types of programmatic as well as focused proposals (Research Experience for Undergraduates - Sites, CAREER, and the like. These research proposals and site visits can most cost-effectively and efficiently be done by Panel Review.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The composition of the panel covers a very broad spectrum of scientific and engineering expertise necessary to properly evaluate the competing proposals, and includes industrial, academic and governmental laboratory researchers and educators, with increasing participation by women, minority and disabled scientists.

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

The Proposal Review Panel held 88 meetings in FY 2020. The number of meetings required each year are related to the number of proposals received and the number of panels needed to review the proposals.

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

Although individual evaluation (i.e., mail review) of proposals is the usual method employed for merit review, combination of mail review and follow-up by panel review provides a more comprehensive basis and rationale for selecting awardees, since panel discussion of competing proposals focuses on strengths and weaknesses of competing proposals, and allows cross comparison of all proposals on a level playing field.

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

Linda Sapochak DFO

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
- Trust in government
- Major policy changes
- Advance in scientific research
- Effective grant making
- Improved service delivery
- Increased customer satisfaction
- Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements
- Other

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?

1,556

Number of Recommendations Comments

The number of recommendations is for the fiscal year. Does not include proposals evaluated only by ad hoc reviewers.

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 carefully 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 - see comments 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, to obtain information on awards made by

the agency and 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	<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 **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 1,402

What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 279

What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$168,885,938

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Access Comments

N/A