

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910455919303321
Titolo	Major award decisionmaking at the National Science Foundation [[electronic resource] /] / Panel on NSF Decisionmaking for Major Awards, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Washington, D.C., : National Academy Press, 1994
ISBN	1-280-24690-1 9786610246908 0-309-58632-1 0-585-14312-9
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (xii, 160 pages)
Disciplina	507.9
Soggetti	Science - Awards - United States Research grants - United States Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	"National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine." "B-274"--T.p. verso.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 156-160).
Nota di contenuto	""MAJOR AWARD DECISION MAKING AT THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION""; ""Copyright""; ""Preface""; ""Contents""; ""Executive Summary""; ""BACKGROUND""; ""FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS""; ""Clear Rules of the Game""; ""Primacy of Technical Merit""; ""Appropriate Roles of Peer Reviewers and Staff""; ""Public Documentation of Decision making""; ""More Stringent Setting of Priorities""; ""RECOMMENDATIONS""; ""Recommendation 1: Justification for Major Project Awards""; ""Recommendation 2: Involvement and Support of the Research Community in Planning"" ""Recommendation 3: Primacy of Technical Merit Criteria"" Recommendation 4: Human Resource Development and Equal Opportunity as a Criterion""; ""Recommendation 5: Cost Sharing as a Criterion""; ""Recommendation 6: A Two-Phase Merit Review Process""; ""Recommendation 7: Reorienting the NSB Workload""; ""Recommendation 8: Planning the Review Process and Criteria"";

""Recommendation 9: More and Better Public Documentation of Award Decisions""; ""Recommendation 10: More Recompetitions""; ""1 Major Awards at NSF ""; ""OVERVIEW OF MAJOR AWARDS""; ""MAJOR AWARDS AND MERIT REVIEW""

""MAJOR AWARDS AND THE NSB""""NSF ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING FOR MERIT REVIEW""; ""OVERALL CONCLUSIONS""; ""Clear Rules of the Game""; ""Primacy of Technical Merit""; ""Appropriate Roles of Peer Reviewers and Staff""; ""Public Documentation of Decision making""; ""More Stringent Setting of Priorities""; ""2 Planning Major Projects ""; ""BACKGROUND: PROJECT PLANNING AND BUDGETING AT NSF""; ""Long-Range Planning at NSF""; ""Annual Budget Process""; ""MAJOR PROJECT PLANNING AND BUDGETING""; ""Capital Facilities Planning""; ""FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PLANNING AND BUDGETING""; ""Findings""

""Recommendations""""Recommendation 1: Justification for Major Project Awards""; ""Recommendation 2: Involvement and Support of the Research Community in Planning""; ""3 Awarding Major Projects: Criteria and Review Procedures ""; ""BACKGROUND: THE MERIT REVIEW PROCESS AT NSF""; ""Current Review Criteria""; ""Review and Selection Criteria for Major Project Awards""; ""Findings and Recommendations on Criteria""; ""Recommendation 3: Primacy of Technical Merit Criteria""; ""Recommendation 4: Human Resource Development and Equal Opportunity as a Criterion""

""Recommendation 5: Cost Sharing as a Criterion""""NSF PROCEDURES FOR REVIEWING PROPOSALS""; ""Proposal Review Process""; ""Peer Review Modes""; ""Selection of Reviewers""; ""Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Bias and Conflict of Interest""; ""Award Decision making""; ""Findings and Recommendations on Review Procedures""; ""Recommendation 6: A Two-Phase Merit Review Process""; ""4 Awarding Major Projects: NSB Role, Review Process Design, and Decision Documentation ""; ""NSB ROLE AND PROCEDURES""; ""Findings and Recommendations on the NSB Role""

""Recommendation 7: Reorienting the NSB Workload""
