

2026 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry

Report Run Date: 06/04/2026 03:58:20 AM

1. Department or Agency	2. Fiscal Year
National Science Foundation	2026
3. Committee or Subcommittee	3b. GSA Committee No.
Proposal Review Panel for Chemistry	1191

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?	5. Current Charter	6. Expected Renewal Date	7. Expected Term Date
No	06/28/2024	06/28/2026	

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?	8b. Specific Termination Authority	8c. Actual Term Date
No		

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year	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	08/16/1990	Continuing	No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total Number of Reports No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open 0 **17b. Closed** 0 **17c. Partially Closed** 0 **Other Activities** 0 **17d. Total** 0

Meetings and Dates

No Meetings

	Current Next	
	FY	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. Administrative Costs (FRNs, contractor support, In-person/hybrid/virtual meetings)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Other (all other funds not captured by any other cost category)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$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 Panels reviewed proposals for the following special initiative activities :
Faculty Early Career Development; Research Experiences for Undergraduates; Chemistry Research Instrumentation and Facilities; Technology for a Sustainable Environment; Professional Opportunities for Women in Research and Education; and Environmental Molecular Science Institutes and Collaborative Research Activities in Environmental Molecular Science. Additionally, panels convened for the purpose of reviewing proposals in Analytical and

Surface Chemistry, Experimental Physical Chemistry, and several CAREER panels in the various subdisciplines with the Chemistry Division. Panels met to review proposals for Research Sites for Education in Chemistry. For each of these activities the panels provided an approximate priority for the funding of the competing proposals. For each of these activities it is important to compare the relative merit of the competing proposals or, in the case of the NSF Career Application, the relative merit of the competing individuals. The broadly-based panels, the membership of which is carefully balanced (see below), provides a depth of insight into all of the important factors which the staff must consider in making its decisions. The panel recommendations are a major factor in the final decisions, but in some cases the Division must take other factors into account in arriving at a final list of successful proposals. For each proposal, the committee prepares a Panel Summary which is provided to the applicant as partial justification for the final decision.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Panel membership includes individuals with expertise in all areas of the science involved, selected for broad geographical distribution, and to provide an appropriate mix of types of colleges and universities, and with women and minority representation at least equal to that in the applicant pool. Industrial scientists are included on virtually all panels.

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

The timing of the meetings is determined by Foundation-wide deadlines and the need to

provide timely reviews and decisions within the six-month interval allowed by Foundation policy. A fair and efficient review requires the use of panels.

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

There is no other standing or ad hoc group that exists that has the blend of backgrounds--technical, institutional, and personal--to provide the Division with the necessary technical review of the proposals being considered.

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

Judith Burstyn Division Director, CHE

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?

1,300

Number of Recommendations Comments

The number of recommendations is for fiscal year 2025.

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 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

What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval 1,298

368

What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval

\$289,336,026

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. The number of recommendations are for the fiscal year.

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