V. APPENDICES

DESCRIPTION OF NSF DIRECTORATES AND MANAGEMENT OFFICES

The **Directorate for Biological Sciences (BIO)** supports research programs ranging from the study of the structure and dynamics of biological molecules, such as proteins and nucleic acids, through cells, organs and organisms, to studies of populations and ecosystems. It encompasses processes that are internal to the organism as well as those that are external, and includes temporal frameworks ranging from measurements in real time through individual life spans, to the full scope of evolutionary times. Among the research programs BIO supports is fundamental academic research on biodiversity, environmental biology, and plant biology, including providing leadership for the Multinational Coordinated *Arabidopsis* Genome Project.

The **Directorate for Computer and Information Sciences and Engineering (CISE)** supports research on the theory and foundations of computing, system software and computer system design, human-computer interaction, as well as prototyping, testing and development of cutting-edge computing and communications systems to address complex research problems. CISE also provides the advanced computing and networking capabilities needed by academic researchers for cutting-edge research in all science and engineering fields.

The **Directorate for Education and Human Resources (EHR)** supports a cohesive and comprehensive set of activities that encompass every level of education and every region of the country. EHR promotes public science literacy and plays a major role in the Foundation's long-standing commitment to developing our nation's human resources for the science and engineering workforce of the future. Focus is given to programs that encourage the participation and achievement of groups underrepresented in science and engineering. NSF-supported education and training programs cover a broad spectrum -- from supporting students and teachers to creating new ways of teaching and learning to assisting school districts and other systems forge greater gains in learning.

The **Directorate for Engineering (ENG)** supports research and education activities that spur new technological innovations and create new products and services and more productive enterprises. ENG also makes critical investments in facilities, networks and people to assure diversity and quality in the nation's infrastructure for engineering education and research.

The **Directorate for Geosciences** (GEO) supports research in the atmospheric, Earth and ocean sciences. Basic research in the Geosciences advances our scientific knowledge of the Earth and advances our ability to predict natural phenomena of economic and human significance, such as climate change, weather, earthquakes, fish-stock fluctuations, and disruptive events in the solar-terrestrial environment. GEO also supports the operation of national user facilities.

The **Directorate for Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS)** supports research and education in astronomical sciences, chemistry, materials research, mathematical sciences and physics. Major equipment and instrumentation such as telescopes and particle accelerators are provided to support the needs of individual investigators. MPS also supports state-of-the-art facilities that enable research at the cutting edge of science and research opportunities in totally new directions.

The **Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE)** supports to research to build fundamental scientific knowledge about human behavior, interaction, and social and economic systems, organizations and institutions. SBE also facilitates NSF's international activities by promoting partnerships between U.S. and foreign researchers, enhancing access to critical research conducted outside the U.S. and increasing knowledge of mutually beneficial research opportunities abroad. To improve understanding of the science and engineering enterprise, SBE also supports science resources studies that are the nation's primary source of data on the science and engineering enterprise.

The **Office of Polar Programs (OPP)**, which includes the U.S. Polar Research Programs and U.S. Antarctic Logistical Support Activities, supports multidisciplinary research in Arctic and Antarctic regions. These

geographic frontiers—premier natural laboratories—are the areas predicted to be the first affected by global change. They are vital to understanding past, present, and future responses of Earth systems to natural and man-made changes. Polar Programs support provides unique research opportunities ranging from studies of the Earth ice and oceans to research in atmospheric sciences and astronomy.

The **Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management (BFA)** is headed by the Chief Financial Officer who has responsibility for budget, financial management, grants administration and procurement operations and related policy. Budget responsibilities include the development of the Foundation's annual budget, long range planning and budget operations and control. BFA's financial, grants and other administrative management systems ensure that the Foundation's resources are well managed and that efficient, streamlined business and management practices are in place. NSF has been acknowledged as a leader in the federal research administration community, especially in its pursuit of a paperless environment that provides more timely, efficient awards administration.

The **Office of Information and Resource Management (OIRM)** provides information systems, human resource management, and general administrative and logistic support functions to the NSF community of scientists, engineers, and educators as well as to the general public. OIRM is responsible for supporting staffing and personnel service requirements for staff members including visiting scientists; NSF's physical infrastructure; dissemination of information about NSF programs to the external community; and administration of NSF's sophisticated technological infrastructure, providing the hardware, software and support systems necessary to manage the Foundation's grant-making process and to maintain advance financial and accounting systems.

National Science Foundation
President's Management Agenda Scorecard

Baseline Results as of September 30, 2001

Initiative	Current Status
Human Capital: NSF received a red because its agency human capital strategy is not integrated into its budget and strategic plans and the agency does not implement succession plans. NSF does use staffing flexibilities well, such as that provided for in the Intergovernmental Personnel Act. NSF is moving expeditiously to develop a Training Academy and to conduct an Organizational Assessment Survey. The agency also will initiate a significant workforce analysis in 2002. The Foundation is developing a five-year administration and management strategic plan to lay out how it plans to address its workforce issues in the coming years.	RED
Competitive Sourcing: NSF has not launched a viable competitive sourcing initiative. In its 2000 analysis of workforce activities, NSF identified 533 positions as performing commercial functions. NSF has not decided if it will compete any positions at this time. The agency wants to wait until it gets results from its upcoming workforce analysis before it makes a decision on competing positions. At that rate it will be difficult for the agency to meet 2003 competition goals. NSF must develop and submit a competitive sourcing plan to meet near-term goals.	RED
Financial Management: NSF is a leader in financial management and has met all core criteria for a green rating for financial management. NSF's financial management systems meet federal financial management system requirements and it has received unqualified and timely audit opinions on its annual financial statements. NSF expedts to maintain this position.	GREEN
E-Government: NSF meets most, but not all, of the standard core criteria for expanding E-Government. All major information technology projects provided sufficient business cases. However, NSF's Government Information Security Reform Act report reflects deficiencies in a number of important areas of security. These concerns include failure to implement information and risk of disruption of essential services. NSF has submitted its corrective action plans and will be reallocating 2002 funds to quickly correct identified problems.	YELLOW
Budget/Performance Integration: NSF's budget does not tie resources to results, provides limited focus on outcomes, and does not charge the full budgetary cost to individual activities. There are inherent difficulties in integrating the budget with performance, given the long-term nature of research in which results may not occur for ten years or more. Nonetheless, NSF could do more. In spring 2002, OMB and the While House office of Science and Technology Policy will work with major research agencies to develop criteria for evaluating basic research during the formulation of the 2004 budget.	RED

KEY:
- ● Green indicates agency as met all core criteria for that initiative.
- ○ Yellow indicates agency achievement of some but not all of OB's core criteria for the initiative and agency has no red conditions.
- ● Red indicates that at least one of the conditions identified by OMB for that initiative is in need of correction.

For a more detailed discussion of the President's Management Agenda, see the Budget of the United States Government, FY 2003.

HOW RESEARCH RESULTS ARE ASSESSED

NSF's Strategic Outcome Goals address how NSF investments have led to results important to the broad mission of the agency. These outcome goals do not lend themselves to quantitative reporting, therefore NSF has developed an alternative format--a qualitative scale that allows NSF to report whether or not the agency has been successful in achieving its outcome goals. Also, because many research results appear long after an investment is made, in some cases ten years or mo re, this assessment report of NSF's program performance is retrospective. That is, the outcome results reported in FY 2001 are from investments made prior to FY 2001. The results of the investments made in FY 2001 will not begin to be reported until beyond FY 2001.

In FY 2001, NSF's Strategic Outcome Goals of Ideas and Tools are expressed in a non-quantitative, qualitative form, each critical to ensure the progress of science. The results reported for the year are collected, tabulated and summarized by aggregating many individual reports prepared by committees of external experts assessing individual programs or clusters of programs throughout the fiscal year. The assessment is retrospective, covering a subset of one-third of NSF's programs that represent activities spanning the entire agency and covering a period of three years or more.

The Strategic Outcome Goal of People includes three performance indicators, of which two are quantitative measures.

The Assessment of Research Results: Committees of external experts are carefully selected to provide NSF with an objective, independent assessment of program results. These committees, known as Committees of Visitors (COVs) and Advisory Committees (ACs), assess approximately one-third of NSF's programs each year. In FY 2001, they were asked to evaluate the progress made by the programs in achieving each of NSF's outcome goals as well as the decision process leading to awards.

Programs are evaluated on a three-year cycle, thus for FY 2001, the years 1998, 1999 and 2000 were most likely to be the years reviewed by the COVs. This process means that each year a different subset of NSF's programs is evaluated by a different group of experts. Hence, in FY 2000, evaluators assessed one-third of NSF's programs and in FY 2001, evaluators assessed a different one-third subset of NSF's programs.

In addition to the programmatic assessments conducted by the COVs and ACs each year, there are program evaluations carried out by independent contractors to addres s specific issues. These program evaluations provide important information that enables NSF program staff to make better decisions about how to best invest NSF resources. These programmatic assessments do not directly address NSF's GPRA goals.

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S STRATEGIC OUTCOME GOALS

Strategic Outcome	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
People Strategic Outcome **Outcome Goal:** Development of "a diverse, internationally competitive and globally-engaged workforce of scientists, engineers, and well-prepared citizens."	***Performance Goal:*** **NSF is successful when, in the aggregate, results reported in the period demonstrate significant achievement in one or more of the following indicators:** • Improved mathematics, science, and technology skills for U.S. students at the K-12 level, and for citizens of all ages, so that they can be competitive in a technological society. • A science and technology and instructional workforce that reflects America's diversity. • Globally engaged science and engineering professionals who are among the best in the world. • A public that is provided access to the benefits of science and engineering research and education. FY 2001 Result: Reports prepared by external experts during FY 2001 GPRA reporting provide assessments and retrospective examples of NSF-supported projects that document significant achievement. *A number of these assessments were emphatic that NSF must continue and increase its efforts related to diversity.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is successful.** • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement* • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement
	Performance Goal: Over 80 % of schools participating in systemic initiative programs will, after three years of NSF support: (1) implement a standard-based curriculum in science and mathematics; (2) further professional development of the instructional workforce; and (3) improve student achievement on a selected battery of tests. FY 2001 Result:** The curriculum, instructional workforce, and improved achievement in science components of the goal were successful. However, less than 80% of schools met the goal of improved student achievement in mathematics. In FY 2002, appropriate technical assistance will be provided to schools not meeting the goal.	**FY 1999:** NSF successful **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is not successful. **
	Performance Goal: Through systemic initiatives and related teacher enhancement programs, NSF will provide intensive professional development experiences for at least 65,000 pre-college teachers. FY 2001 Result: In school year 1999-2000, EHR awards provided intensive professional development (60 hours or more) to a total of 79,000 teachers, exceeding substantially the GPRA goal of 65,000.	**FY 1999:** NSF successful **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S STRATEGIC OUTCOME GOALS (continued)

Strategic Outcome	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Ideas Strategic Outcome: **Outcome Goal:** Enabling "discovery across the frontier of science and engineering, connected to learning, innovation and service to society."	*Performance Goal:* **NSF is successful when, in the aggregate, results reported in the period demonstrate significant achievement in one or more of the following indicators:** • A robust and growing fundamental knowledge base that enhances progress in all science and engineering areas including the science of learning. • Discoveries that advance the frontiers of science, engineering and technology. • Partnerships connecting discovery to innovation, learning, and societal advancement. • Research and education processes that are synergistic. FY 2001 Result: Reports prepared by external experts during FY 2001 GPRA reporting provide assessments and retrospective examples of NSF-supported projects that document significant achievement.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is successful.** • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement
Tools Strategic Outcome **Outcome Goal:** Providing "broadly accessible, state-of-the art and shared research and education tools."	*Performance Goal:* **NSF is successful when, in the aggregate, results reported in the period demonstrate significant achievement in one or more of the following indicators:** • Shared use platforms, facilities, instruments, and databases that enable discovery and enhance the productivity and effectiveness of the science and engineering workforce. • Networking and connectivity that take full advantage of the Internet and make SMET information available to all citizens. • Information and policy analyses that contribute to the effective use of science and engineering resources. FY 2001 Result: Reports prepared by external experts during FY 2001 GPRA reporting provide assessments and retrospective examples of NSF-supported projects that document significant achievement. *There are very limited contributions and limited involvement of agency programs other than Science Resources Statistics (SRS) in developing information and other materials fundamental to national policy debates.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is successful.** • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement • Demonstrated significant achievement*

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S MANAGEMENT GOALS

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
NSF Business Practices		
Electronic Proposal Submission	**_Performance Goal:_** 95% of full proposals will be received electronically through FastLane. FY 1998 Baseline 17% FY 1999 Result 44% FY 2000 Goal 60% FY 2000 Result 81% FY 2001 Goal 95% FY 2001 Result 99%	**FY 1999**: NSF successful **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Electronic Proposal Processing	**_Performance Goal:_** In FY 2001, NSF will conduct ten pilot paperless projects that manage the competitive review process in an electronic environment. FY 2001 Result: Ten pilot paperless projects were completed.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Video-Conference/Long-Distance Communications	**_Performance Goal:_** By the end of FY 2001, NSF will increase usage of a broad range of video-conferencing / long distance communications technology by 100 % over the FY 1999 level. FY 2001 Result: 142 videoconferences were conducted, an increase of 184 % over the 1999 level.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
NSF Staff		
Diversity	**_Performance Goal:_** NSF will show an increase over 1997 in the total number of hires to science and engineering positions from underrepresented groups. FY 1997 Baseline: 16 females and 15 members of underrepresented minority groups were hired. FY 2000 Result: 35 females and 19 members of underrepresented minority groups were hired. FY 2001 Result: 38 females and 22 members of underrepresented minority groups were hired.	Goal revised in FY 2000 **FY 1999**: NSF successful for related goal **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S MANAGEMENT GOALS (continued)

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Work Environment	***Performance Goal:*** NSF will establish various baselines that will enable management to better assess the quality of worklife and work environment within the Foundation. FY 2001 Result: Development of an employee survey is underway. This survey will provide baseline information on the quality of worklife and work environment at NSF. In FY 2002, the survey will be made available to employees.	New goal in FY 2001 **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S INVESTMENT PROCESS GOALS

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Proposal and Award Processes		
Use of Merit Review	___**Performance Goal:**___ At least 85 % of basic and applied research funds will be allocated to projects that undergo merit review. * FY 2000 Goal 80% FY 2000 Result 87% FY 2001 Goal 85% FY 2001 Result 88% *During FY 2000, OMB re-defined what constitutes a merit-reviewed project and established a new target level of 70-90%.*	Goal revised in FY 2000 **FY 1999**: NSF successful for related goal **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Implementation of Merit Review Criteria – Reviewers	___**Performance Goal:**___ NSF performance in implementation of the merit review criteria is successful when reviewers address the elements of both generic review criteria. FY 2001 Result: Program reports prepared by external experts during FY 2001 GPRA reporting provide assessment of implementation of merit review criteria for reviewers. In FY 1998 – FY 2000, reviewers did not consistently address the broader impacts criterion. In FY 2001, NSF added separate review screens to FastLane to enable reviewers to address each merit-review criterion separately. NSF also established an internal task force to examine strategies to improve both proposer and reviewer attention to the broader impacts criterion. A number of FY 2001 reports note that reviewers are making significant progress in utilizing both merit review criteria. In FY 2002, NSF will continue to develop and apply recommendations that focus on strategies that stress the importance of using both criteria. It will also collect and make available examples of broader impacts and develop a plan to disseminate them.	Goal revised in FY 2001. **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**
Implementation of Merit Review Criteria – Program Officers	___**Performance Goal.**___ NSF performance in implementation of the merit review criteria is successful when program officers address the elements of both generic review criteria when making their award decisions. FY 2001 Result: Program reports prepared by external experts during FY 2001 GPRA reporting result in an assessment of successful for the foundation in implementation of both merit review criteria for program managers.	Goal revised in FY 2001. **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S INVESTMENT PROCESS GOALS (continued)

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Customer Service: Time to Prepare Proposals	**Performance Goal:** 95 % of program announcements will be available to relevant individuals and organizations at least three months prior to the proposal deadline or target date. FY 1998 Baseline 66% FY 1999 Result 75% FY 2000 Goal 95% FY 2000 Result 89% FY 2001 Goal 95% FY 2001 Result 100%	**FY 1999**: NSF not successful **FY 2000:** NSF not successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Customer Service: Time to Decision	**Performance Goal:** For 70 % of proposals, be able to tell applicants whether their proposals have been declined or recommended for funding within six months of receipt. FY 1998 Baseline 59% FY 1999 Result 58% FY 2000 Goal 70% FY 2000 Result 54% FY 2001 Goal 70% FY 2001 Result 62% FY 2001 Result: In FY 2001, 62% of proposals were processed within 6 months of receipt. In FY 2002, NSF will continue to focus on improving the efficiency of proposal processing, including the dissemination of best practices to program staff.	**FY 1999:** NSF not successful **FY 2000:** NSF not successful **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**
Award Size	**Performance Goal:** NSF will increase the average annualized award size for research projects to $110,000. FY 1998 $90,000 FY 1999 $94,000 FY 2000 $105,800 FY 2001 Goal $110,000 FY 2001 Result $113,601	New goal in FY 2001. **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**

RESULTS OF NSF'S INVESTMENT PROCESS GOALS
(continued)

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Award Duration	**_Performance Goal:_** NSF will increase the average duration of awards for research projects to at least three years. FY 1998 Baseline 2.7 years FY 1999 Goal 2.8 years FY 1999 Result 2.8 years FY 2000 Result 2.8 years FY 2001 Goal 3.0 years <u>FY 2001 Result</u> 2.9 years <u>FY 2001 Result:</u> Resource limitations impacted NSF's ability to achieve both the award size and award duration goals. NSF focused its efforts on increasing average annualized award size. In FY 2002, NSF will continue to focus on increasing award size and duration in order to improve the efficiency of the research process.	**FY 1999:** NSF successful **FY 2000:** Not applicable **FY 2001: NSF is not successful**.
Maintaining Openness in the System	**_Performance Goal:_** NSF will award 30 % of its research grants to new investigators. FY 1997 Baseline 27% FY 1998 27% FY 1999 Goal 30% FY 1999 Result 27% FY 2000 Goal 30% FY 2000 Result 28% FY 2001 Goal 30% <u>FY 2001 Result</u> 28% In FY 2002, NSF will continue its outreach to new investigators to promote awareness of research funding and to encourage new investigators to submit proposals.	**FY 1999:** NSF not successful **FY 2000:** NSF not successful **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**

FY 2001 RESULTS OF NSF'S INVESTMENT PROCESS GOALS
(continued)

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Broadening Participation		
Reviewer Pool	***Performance Goal:*** NSF will begin to request voluntary demographic data electronically from all reviewers to determine participation levels of members of underrepresented groups in the NSF reviewer pool. FY 2001 Result: The reviewer system in FastLane was revised to gather voluntary demographic data.	New goal in FY 2001. **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Facilities Oversight		
Construction and Upgrade	***Performance Goal:*** For 90 % of facilities, keep construction and upgrades within annual expenditure plan, not to exceed 110 % of estimates. FY 1999 Result: Majority of facilities within 110 % of annual spending estimates. FY 2000 Result: Of the 11 construction and upgrade projects, all were within annual expenditure plans; most were under budget. FY 2001 Result: Of 25 construction and upgrade projects, 24 (96 %) were within 110 % of annual expenditure plans.	Goal revised in FY 2001 **FY 1999:** NSF successful for related goal **FY 2000:** NSF successful **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**

FY 2001 RESUTLS OF NSF'S INVESTMENT PROCESS GOALS
(continued)

Performance Area	FY 2001 Annual Performance Goal	Results for National Science Foundation
Construction and Upgrade	***Performance Goal:*** 90% of facilities will meet all annual schedule milestones by the end of the reporting period. FY 1999 Result: Majority of facilities on schedule. FY 2000 Result: Majority (7 of 11) of construction/upgrade projects within the annual schedule goal. FY 2001 Result: Of the 25 construction and upgrade projects, 21 (84 %) met all annual schedule milestones by the end of the reporting period. Project delays were caused in part by circumstances beyond the control of the facility, technical problems and personnel issues. In FY 2002, NSF will work with awardees to identify obstacles to successful performance and implement plans to avoid or mitigate their consequences in the future.	Goal revised in FY 2001. **FY 1999:** NSF successful for related goal **FY 2000:** NSF not successful for related goal **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**
Construction and Upgrade	***Performance Goal:*** For all construction and upgrade projects initiated after 1996, keep total cost within 110 % of estimates made at the initiation of construction. FY 2001 Result: One project was completed. The actual total cost was equal to the estimated total cost.	**FY 1999 and FY 2000:** There were no projects completed, therefore this goal did not apply. **FY 2001: NSF is successful.**
Operations and Management of Facilities	***Performance Goal:*** For 90 % of facilities, keep operating time lost due to unscheduled downtime to less than 10 % of the total scheduled operating time. FY 1999 Result: Reporting database under development. FY 2000 Result: Of the 26 reporting facilities, 22 (85%) met the goal of keeping unscheduled downtime to below 10% of the total scheduled operating time. FY 2001 Result: Of the 29 reporting facilities, 25 (86 %) met the goal of keeping unscheduled downtime to below 10 % of the total scheduled operating time. Some causes of failure were outside the control of the facility or were related to technical problems. In FY 2002, NSF will continue to work with awardees to identify obstacles to successful performance and develop plans to avoid or mitigate their consequences in the future.	Goal revised in FY 2001. **FY 1999:** Inconclusive for related goal **FY 2000:** NSF not successful for related goal **FY 2001: NSF is not successful.**

NSF EXECUTIVE STAFF AND NSF OFFICERS

NSF Executive Staff

Office of the Director
Rita R. Colwell, Director
Joseph Bordogna, Deputy Director

National Science Board
Eamon M. Kelly, Chair
Marta Cehelsky, Executive Officer

Office of Equal Opportunity Programs
Ana A. Ortiz, Program Manager

Office of the General Counsel
Lawrence Rudolph, General Counsel

Office of the Inspector General
Christine C. Boesz, Inspector General

Office of Integrative Activities
Nathaniel G. Pitts, Director

Office of Legislative and Public Affairs
Curtis Suplee, Director

Office of Polar Programs
Karl A. Erb, Director

Directorate for Biological Sciences
Mary E. Clutter, Assistant Director

Directorate for Computer and Information Sciences and Engineering
George Strawn, Acting Assistant Director

Directorate for Education and Human Resources
Judith A. Ramaley, Assistant Director

Directorate for Engineering
Esin Gulari, Acting Assistant Director

Directorate for Geosciences
Margaret S. Leinen, Assistant Director

Directorate for Mathematical and Physical Sciences
Robert A. Eisenstein, Assistant Director

Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
Norman M. Bradburn, Assistant Director

Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management
Thomas N. Cooley, Director

Office of Information and Resource Management
Linda P. Massaro, Director

NSF Officers

Chief Financial Officer
Thomas N. Cooley (Office of Budget, Finance, and Award Management)

Chief Information Officer
Linda P. Massaro (Office of Information and Resource Management)

NSF Affirmative Action Officer
Ana A. Ortiz (Office of Equal Opportunity Programs)

National Science Board

NSB Chair
Eamon M. Kelly
President Emeritus and Professor
Tulane University

NSB Vice Chair
Anita K. Jones
Department of Computer Science
University of Virginia

Members
John A. Armstrong
Vice President for Science and Technology
IBM (Retired)

Nina V. Fedoroff
Willaman Professor of Life Sciences
Director, Life Sciences Consortium
Director, Biotechnology Institute
The Pennsylvania State University

Pamela A. Ferguson
Professor of Mathematics
Grinnell College

Mary K. Gaillard
Professor of Physics
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

M.R.C. Greenwood
Chancellor
University of California at Santa Cruz

Stanley V. Jaskolski
Vice President
Eaton Corporation (Retired)

George M. Langford
Professor, Department of Biological Science
Dartmouth College

Jane Lubchenco
Wayne and Gladys Valley Professor of Marine Biology
Distinguished Professor of Zoology
Oregon State University

Joseph A. Miller, Jr.
Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer
Corning, Incorporated

Diana S. Natalicio
President
The University of Texas at El Paso

Robert C. Richardson
Vice Provost for Research
Professor of Physics
Cornell University

Michael G. Rossmann
Hanley Distinguished Professor of Biological Sciences
Purdue University

Vera C. Rubin
Department of Terrestrial Magnetism
Carnegie Institution of Washington

Maxine Savitz
General Manager, Technology Partnerships
Honeywell

Luis Sequeira
Departments of Bacteriology and Plant Pathology
University of Wisconsin at Madison

Daniel Simberloff
Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
University of Tennessee at Knoxville

Bob H. Suzuki
President
California State Polytechnic University

Richard Tapia
Department of Computational and Applied Mathematics
Rice University

Chang-Lin Tien
Department of Mechanical Engineering
University of California at Berkeley

Warren M. Washington
Senior Scientist and Section Head
National Center for Atmospheric Research

John A. White, Jr.
Chancellor
University of Arkansas at Fayetteville

Mark S. Wrighton
Chancellor
Washington University at Saint Louis

Rita R. Colwell, *Member Ex Officio*
Chair, Executive Committee
Director, National Science Foundation

Marta Cehelsky
Executive Officer, National Science Board

List of Acronyms

AC	Advisory Committee	IPA	Intergovernmental Personnel Act
AGI	*Arabidopsis* Genome Initiative	IPAY	Integrated Payroll System
AMORE	Arctic Mid-Ocean Ridge Expedition	ITAS	Integrated Time and Attendance System
BFA	Office of Budget, Finance and Award Management	K-12	Kindergarten through Grade 12
		LTER	Long-term Ecological Research
BIO	Directorate for Biological Sciences	MCC	Management Controls Committee
		MPS	Directorate for Mathematical and Physical Sciences
CAREER	Faculty Career Early Development Program		
CFO	Chief Financial Officer	MRE	Major Research Equipment
CIO	Chief Information Officer	MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging
CIP	Construction in Progress	NAIC	National Astronomy and Ionosphere Center
CISE	Directorate for Computer and Information Science and Engineering	NAPA	National Academy of Public Administration
		NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
CMB	Cosmic Microwave Background	NOAO	National Optical Astronomy Observatories
COV	Committee of Visitors	NRAO	National Radio Astronomy Observatories
CSRS	Civil Service Retirement System	NSB	National Science Board
DGA	Division of Grants and Agreements	NSF	National Science Foundation
		OIG	Office of Inspector General
DOL	U.S. Department of Labor	OIRM	Office of Information and Resource Management
EFT	Electronic Fund Transfer		
EHR	Directorate for Education and Human Resources	OMB	White House Office of Management and Budget
ENG	Directorate for Engineering	OPAC	On-line Payment and Collection
FASAB	Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board	OPM	Office of Personnel Management
		OPP	Office of Polar Programs
FECA	Federal Employees Compensation Act	PATS	Program Announcement Template
		PIT	People, Ideas Tools
FERS	Federal Employees Retirement System	PP&E	Property, Plant and Equipment
		PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
FFMIA	Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996	R&RA	Research and Related Activities
		SBE	Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences
FFRDC	Federally Funded Research and Development Centers		
FMFIA	Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982	SBIR	Small Business Innovation Research
		S&E	Salaries and Expenses
FRTIB	Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board	SFFAS	Statement of Federal Financial Accounting Standards
GAO	General Accounting Office		
GEO	Directorate for Geosciences	UCAR	National Center for Atmospheric Research
GPRA	Government Performance and Results Act of 1993		
		USC	United States Code
GSA	General Services Administration	USAP	U.S. Antarctic Program
		USI	Urban Systemic Initiative
HHS	U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	VSEE	Visiting Scientists, Engineers and Educators
H-1B	Nonimmigrant Petitioner Visa	WTC	World Trade Center
IG	Inspector General		