

## 2021 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Undergraduate Education

Report Run Date: 05/01/2021 10:43:20 AM

<b>1. Department or Agency</b>		<b>2. Fiscal Year</b>	
National Science Foundation		2021	
<b>3. Committee or Subcommittee</b>		<b>3b. GSA Committee No.</b>	
Proposal Review Panel for Undergraduate Education		1214	
<b>4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?</b>	<b>5. Current Charter</b>	<b>6. Expected Renewal Date</b>	<b>7. Expected Term Date</b>
No	06/29/2020	06/29/2022	
<b>8a. Was Terminated During FiscalYear?</b>	<b>8b. Specific Termination Authority</b>	<b>8c. Actual Term Date</b>	
No			
<b>9. Agency Recommendation for Next FiscalYear</b>	<b>10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?</b>	<b>10b. Legislation Pending?</b>	
Continue	No	Not Applicable	
<b>11. Establishment Authority</b>	Agency Authority		
<b>12. Specific Establishment Authority</b>	<b>13. Effective Date</b>	<b>14. Committee Type</b>	<b>14c. Presidential?</b>
ADM IV-100	01/02/1991	Continuing	No
<b>15. Description of Committee</b>	Grant Review Committee		
<b>16a. Total Number of Reports</b>	No Reports for this FiscalYear		
<b>17a. Open Meetings and Dates</b>	<b>17b. Closed</b>	<b>17c. Partially Closed</b>	<b>Other Activities</b>
No Meetings	0	0	0

	Current FY	Next FY
<b>18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff</b>	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants</b>	\$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

**19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)**

0.00 0.00

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

The Division received 1913 proposals in FY20 of which 478 were funded. The outside expert advice, discussion, reports, and recommendations on the merit and potential of proposals are the primary input the Division uses to make funding recommendations. The committee's advice is weighed carefully by the program staff in making decisions on which proposals should be recommended for funding.

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

Over 800 panelists were selected in FY20 for their technical expertise in scientific, mathematical and engineering fields. In addition, members are selected to represent diverse populations. We include all parts of the US and its territories; members represent all kinds of institutions, including 2-year colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive universities, doctoral and research universities, industry, and scientific laboratories; and we make particular efforts to include members who are from underrepresented groups, including women, minorities, and people with disabilities. Members provide evaluation of proposals after discussion with other members with diverse points of view.

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

The Division receives new proposals at announced deadlines throughout the year. Meetings are held to review new proposals shortly after proposal deadlines. In FY20, 156 panels were convened. Panelists meet as a group then break into smaller subgroups before the review process commences.

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

Panel review can provide judgments about the merits of a group of proposals or about a complex multidisciplinary proposal that cannot be obtained in any other way. Often members have complementary expertise, and no one member has the expertise alone to evaluate a proposal or a group of proposals.

**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**

Robin Wright Division Director, DUE

**Narrative Description**

The NSF mission as 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**

NA

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

1,913

### **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**

NA

**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**

NA

**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 **Number** of grants reviewed for approval 1,913
- What is the estimated **Number** of grants recommended for approval 478
- What is the estimated **Dollar Value** of grants recommended for approval \$259,287,924

**Grant Review Comments**

NA

**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