2024 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical Sciences

Report Run Date: 04/19/2024 05:34:23 PM

1. Department or Agency 2. Fiscal Year

National Science Foundation 2024

3b. GSA

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Committee No.

Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical

Sciences

1204

Sciences

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date Term Date

No 06/29/2022 06/29/2024

8a. Was Terminated During 8b. Specific Termination Authority 8c. Actual Term Date

No

9. Agency 10b.

Recommendation for Next Req to Terminate?

| Continue of the c

Continue No Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority Agency Authority

12. Specific 13. 14.

Establishment Effective Committee Presidential?

Authority Date Type

ADM IV-100 08/30/1990 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total

No Reports for this FiscalYear

Reports

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. 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 Division supports a wide range of projects aimed at developing and exploring the properties and applications of mathematical structures. Most of these projects represent the research programs of single investigators or small groups of investigators working with graduate students and postdoctoral researchers. The Proposal Review Panels advise on the merits of these special initiative proposals and applications.

Approximately 2910 proposals were received in the division this year.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Membership is selected in response to specific

proposals and applications to be reviewed. More than 900 individuals served as panelists in FY23. Members were selected for their demonstrated scientific and engineering expertise so as to represent a reasonable balance of capability in the various subfields of the proposals to be reviewed. Consideration was given to achieving geographic balance and to enhancing representation for women, minority, junior investigators, and persons with disabilities.

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

Seventy Eight meetings were held for continuance of advice on special initiative proposals or applications submitted to NSF for financial support.

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 proposal or a facility.

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

Reviewed proposals 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

Junping Wang Deputy 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 judgement 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	h 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 <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,910

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 <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Fully</u> implemented by the agency?

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

The word implement is not applicable to the grant review panels. All recommendations are considered by the agency.

What is the approximate $\underline{\text{Percentage}}$ of these recommendations that have been or will be $\underline{\text{Partially}}$ implemented by the agency?

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NA

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to

implement recommendations or advice Yes ✓ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐	e offered?
• •	feedback, each committee member may use the ram, which provides information on awards made of proposals reviewed by the panel.
What other actions has the agency tak recommendation?	en as a result of the committee's advice or
	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	w of applications for grants?
What is the estimated Number of grants	reviewed for approval
What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Number}}$ of grants	recommended for 2,891
approval	800
What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Dollar Value}}$ of gra	ants recommended for approval
	\$262,878,293
Grant Review Comments	
, ,	ers provided information on the merit of the
, ,	The number of proposals above includes
	w. The pre-proposals are not included in the
number of grants recommend or dollar va	alue of grants recommended for approval.
How is access provided to the information	tion 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