

2001 Current Fiscal Year Report: Advisory Panel for Cognitive, Psychological, and Language Sciences

Report Run Date: 07/16/2025 06:13:17 AM

1. Department or Agency

National Science Foundation

2. Fiscal Year

2001

3. Committee or Subcommittee

Advisory Panel for Cognitive, Psychological, and Language Sciences

3b. GSA

Committee

No.

1758

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

06/30/1999

6. Expected Renewal Date

06/30/2001

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

Yes

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

06/30/2001

9. Agency

Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

No

10b.

Legislation Pending?

11. Establishment Authority Agency Authority

12. Specific Establishment Authority

ADM IV-100

13. Effective Date

10/01/1993

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee Grant Review Committee

16a. Total

Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a.

Open

0

17b. Closed

4

17c. Partially Closed

4

Other Activities

0

17d. Total

8

Meetings and Dates

Purpose

Proposal review - Linguistics

Proposal review - Child Learning & Development

Start

10/11/2000 - 10/13/2000

11/09/2000 - 11/10/2000

End

Proposal review - Human Cognition & Perception	11/29/2000 - 12/01/2000
Proposal review - Social Psychology	11/30/2000 - 12/01/2000
Proposal Review - Linguistics	04/18/2001 - 04/20/2001
Proposal Review - Social Psychology	05/07/2001 - 05/09/2001
Proposal Review - Human Cognition & Perception	05/15/2001 - 05/17/2001
Proposal Review - Developmental & Learning Sciences	05/24/2001 - 05/25/2001

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 8

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$10,908.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$73,301.00	\$0.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$23,612.00	\$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)	\$6,598.00	\$0.00
18e. Total Costs	\$114,419.00	\$0.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.33	0.00

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The Panel reviewed and evaluated 483 research proposals during FY 2001. Each Panel member was responsible for providing the primary or secondary review and leading an in-depth discussion for approximately 16-20 proposals each meeting. In nearly all cases, the Program's final actions on the proposals directly reflected the Panel's evaluations. During the open meetings in the Spring, the Panel discussed a number of issues relevant to the goals and operations of the Programs, as well as opportunities in the field. Members commented on scientific developments in their areas of expertise and how these related to NSF and national goals. Discussion included opportunities in the areas of human cognition and perception, linguistics, social and developmental psychology, children's learning and development, cognitive neuroscience children's research initiative, learning and intelligent systems, and the human capital initiative. The potential impact of these trends on NSF were also discussed and how to increase awareness in these research fields. These discussions considered the distinct roles to be played by the research community itself, professional associations, lobbying groups and the media.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

The selection of members ensures a balance of men and women throughout the US and a representation of ethnic minorities. Because the social psychology proposals involve research both in social development and in the broader traditional areas of social psychology, two panelists were experts in social development psychology and five were experts in general social psychology with emphasis in emotion and self-concept, interpersonal relations, attitudes and

personality theory. Some members also represented a comprehensive set of theoretical perspectives and research orientations with expertise in perceptual processes, cognitive processes such as memory, attention, concept formation, reasoning, reading, language acquisition and other language-related processes, motor behavior, mathematical and computational modeling of cognitive and perceptual processes, and child learning and development.

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

The Panel meets seven - nine times a year for a maximum of three days per session, four times in the Spring and four in the Fall to review research proposals submitted for the January and July target dates. This advisory function is crucial to Program operation because it provides detailed, thoughtful, expert opinion about submitted research proposals and it provides directed input on current and future directions. Also, the Panel will continue to hold open sessions during the Spring meetings for discussion of broader issues and advice to the Program on how NSF may best serve the field.

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

The Panel's role in the merit review process is unique in three ways: (a) Each proposal is sent out by mail for review by ad hoc reviewers, who are specialists in the research area the proposal represents. The Panel has the opportunity to comment on the reviews as well as the proposal, thus helping the Program to interpret the reviews and place them in context, and to identify any unfounded criticisms contained in the reviews. (b) The Panel sees the proposals collectively,

whereas the ad hoc reviewers see only a single proposal, and thus the Panel can advise the Program about comparative strengths and weaknesses among proposals. (c) The Panelists are nationally known as leading figures in their respective areas of the field, and their visible close involvement in the review process lends its stature and credibility in the research community. The Advisory Panel provides a more balanced assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular proposal than can ad hoc reviewers. No other constituted panels have the expertise to evaluate these 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

Designated Federal Officer

Hilleary D. Everist Division Director, BCS

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
Abrams, Richard	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Washington University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Andersen, George	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of California/Riverside	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Beddor, Patrice	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Michigan	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Burnett, Myra	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Spelman College	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Clark, Margaret	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Carnegie Mellon University/Pittsburgh PA	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Cohen, Neil	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Illinois/ Urbana-Champaign	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Colombo, John	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Kansas	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Dannemiller, James	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Wisconsin/Madison	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Demuth, Katherine	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Brown University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Feldman-Barrett, Lisa	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Boston College	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Gibson, Edward	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Goldman, Susan	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Vanderbilt University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Goodwin, Stephanie	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Yale University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Graham, Sandra	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of California/Los Angeles	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Greenfield, Patricia	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of California/Los Angeles	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hakuta, Kenji	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Stanford University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Harris, Alice	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Vanderbilt University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Heller, Wendy	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Illinois/Champaign	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Hualde, Jose	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Illinois/Urbana-Champaign	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Irwin, David	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Illinois/Champaign	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Kanwisher, Nancy	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Knowlton, Barbara	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of California/Los Angeles	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Kruschke, John	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Indiana University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lakshmanan, Usha	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Southern Illinois University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Laosa, Luis	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Educational Testing Service/Princeton	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Liben, Lynn	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Pennsylvania State University/University Park	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lucariello, Joan	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Boston College	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Lust, Barbara	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Cornell University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Mangelsdorf, Sarah	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Illinois/Champaign	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Markman, Arthur	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Texas/Austin	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Martinez, Michael	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Irvine	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Miller, Kevin	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Beckman Institute	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Morrison, Frederick	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Loyola University/Chicago	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Murnane, Kevin	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Maryland/College Park	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Nicol, Janet	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Arizona/Tuscon	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Niednethal, Paula	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Universite Blaise Pascal	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

O'Connor, Mary	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Boston University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Okagaki, Lynn	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Purdue University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Parker, Jeffrey	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Pennsylvania State University/University Park	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Paulus, Paul	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Texas at Arlington	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Perfetti, Charles	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Pittsburgh	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Peterson, Mary	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Arizona/Tuscon	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Sells, Peter	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Stanford University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Sprouse, Rex	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Indiana University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Winford, Donald	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	Ohio State University	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member
Zarate, Michael	10/01/2000	09/30/2002	University of Texas/El Paso	Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 46

Narrative Description

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if
Applies

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

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

0

Number of Recommendations Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

Agency Feedback Comments

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 type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

No

Grant Review Comments

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Contact DFO | <input 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