

Title	Meeting Date	Recommendation	NSF Contact	Status	Explanation
BSR Subcommittee	Spring 2014	While some disagreed, the Committee acknowledges the reluctance of NSF to use business administrators from other NSF large facilities as BSR reviewers, citing issues of conflict of interest and recompetition of facilities. The BSR teams have recently included retired NSF subject matter experts. Committee endorsed this approach as a very good compromise and encouraged this process to continue.	Matt Hawkins; Florence Rabanal	Closed	
BSR Subcommittee	Spring 2014	While collaboration between the BSR program and DACS continues to improve, there is a need to formalize the handoff process from the BSR to DACS for the most effective postaward monitoring of large facilities	Matt Hawkins; Florence Rabanal	Closed	
Linking NSF Organizational Goals and Objectives with Employee Performance Plans	Spring 2014	NSF staff is on the right track for dealing with this highly complex, but very important issue. NSF has taken only initial steps toward linking performance measures to plans.	Judith Sunley	Closed	The Committee voted to accept the report with enthusiasm and to forward it to Marty Rubenstein and Cliff Gabriel.
Measuring Effective Policy Implementation: Uniform Guidance	Spring 2014	Determine policy drivers/motivators behind the UG and its metrics; focus communications on those policy motivators of particular concern to NSF. Appropriately manage the message, conveying what is of importance to NSF, while making clear that the metrics are only measures of progress toward NSF's goals and are not goals themselves.	Jean Feldman; Alexander Wynnyk	In Progress	
Measuring Effective Policy Implementation: Uniform Guidance	Spring 2014	Communicate goals and objectives and how chosen measures would be used to assess progress both within NSF and the awardee community.	Jean Feldman; Alexander Wynnyk	In Progress	
Measuring Effective Policy Implementation: Uniform Guidance	Spring 2014	Continue communications with OMB and COFAR regarding the types of problems that should be expected given the short amount of time NSF and its awardees are being given to implement the extensive new requirements of the UG.	Jean Feldman; Alexander Wynnyk	In Progress	When the Committee presented these observations and recommendations to Director Córdova and Deputy Director Marrett, Dr. Marrett suggested the formation of a subcommittee to further assist NSF in determining how to manage UG implementation and the related metrics.
Virtual Panels	Spring 2014	Diversity of virtual panel technology is important, but NSF must be careful to watch that it does not unduly complicate the Foundation's work. The Committee has earlier suggested that NSF was using too many different technologies, and applauded the move toward a smaller number of standard technologies.	Jose Munoz	Closed	

Title	Meeting Date	Recommendation	NSF Contact	Status	Explanation
Virtual Panels	Spring 2014	It may be difficult to obtain good data on how panelists evaluate virtual versus face-to-face panels, but it is important, particularly to help NSF strike the right balance between virtual and face-to-face panels. The Committee suggested that perhaps direct interviews with samples of panelists might yield better data than questionnaires sent to all panelists.	Jose Munoz	Closed	
Virtual Panels	Spring 2014	NSF should consider carefully its policies and expectations for end-user equipment such as webcams and headsets. Virtual panels do not work well when panelists lack this equipment, but the Foundation does not yet have clear policies for who should purchase such equipment, and how it should be distributed and retrieved. Currently the burden rests entirely on panelists, and this may be an inappropriate transfer of costs from the Foundation to panelists.	Jose Munoz	Closed	