### 2025 Current Fiscal Year Report: Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical Sciences

Report Run Date: 07/04/2025 01:38:11 AM

1. Department or Agency 2. Fiscal Year

National Science Foundation 2025

3b. GSA 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Committee No.

Proposal Review Panel for Mathematical

1204 Sciences

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

No 06/28/2024 06/28/2026

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

No

9. Agency 10b.

10a. Legislation **Recommendation for Next** Legislation Reg to Terminate? **FiscalYear** Pending?

Continue No Not Applicable

**11. Establishment Authority** Agency Authority

12. Specific 14. 13.

14c. Establishment Effective Commitee Presidential?

Authority Date **Type** 

**ADM IV-100** 08/30/1990 Continuing No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total

No Reports for Number of this FiscalYear

Reports

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	\$0.00\$0.00
Federal Members	
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to	\$0.00\$0.00
Federal Staff	
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to	00 00 00
Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to	Фо оо фо оо
Non-Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to	<b>.</b>
Federal Members	\$0.00\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to	\$0.00\$0.00
Federal Staff	
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to	<b>\$0,00\$0,00</b>
Non-member Consultants	\$0.00\$0.00
18c. Administrative Costs (FRNs,	
contractor support,	<b>#</b> 0.00 <b>#</b> 0.00
In-person/hybrid/virtual	\$0.00\$0.00
meetings)	
18d. Other (all other funds not	
captured by any other cost	\$0.00\$0.00
category)	
18e. Total Costs	\$0.00\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years	0.00 0.00
(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 2962 proposals were reviewed and processed 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 1000 individuals served as panelists in FY24. 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 researchers, and persons with disabilities.

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

Eighty Nine 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**

### 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 <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,962

#### **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?

100%

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

NA	
Does the agency provide the committee wit implement recommendations or advice offer Yes No Not Applicable	
Agency Feedback Comments  Although panelists may not receive direct feedle NSF FastLane, a public web-based program, we by the agency to determine the outcome of program.	which provides information on awards made
What other actions has the agency taken as recommendation?	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 of a	applications for grants?
What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Number}}$ of grants review	ved for approval
What is the estimated $\underline{\textbf{Number}}$ of grants recon	nmended for 2,946
approval	737
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants re	ecommended for approval \$219,349,655
<b>Grant Review Comments</b>	
The panelists/advisory committee members pro	ovided 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

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

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	$\checkmark$
Online Agency Web Site	
Online Committee Web Site	
Online GSA FACA Web Site	
Publications	
Other	
Access Comments	
N/A	