MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

SUBJECT: Major Actions and Approvals at the September 28-29, 2005 Meeting

This memorandum will be made publicly available for any interested parties to review. A more detailed summary of the meeting will be posted on the National Science Board (NSB, the Board) public Web site within 10 business days. A comprehensive set of NSB-approved Open Session meeting minutes will be posted on the Board’s public Web site following its November-December 2005 meeting.

Major actions and approvals at the 388th meeting of the Board included the following (not in priority order):

1. The Board approved the minutes of the Plenary Open Session (NSB-05-105) for the August 2005 meeting (http://www.nsf.gov/nsb/meetings/2005/0805/open_min.pdf). Minutes for the Plenary Executive Closed and Closed Sessions for the August 2005 meeting of the NSB were also approved.

2. The Board approved a resolution to close portions of the upcoming November 30-December 1, 2005 NSB meeting dealing with staff appointments; future budgets; pending proposals/awards for specific grants, contracts, or other arrangements; those portions dealing with specific Office of the Inspector General investigations and enforcement actions, or agency audit guidelines; and NSF participation in a civil or administrative action, proceeding, or arbitration (NSB-05-114) (Attachment 1).

3. The Board approved the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP) and the award of any resulting contract to be determined by competitive procurement for helicopter services to support the United States Antarctic Program.

4. The Board approved the process of establishing the National Science Board Commission on 21st Century Education in Science, Mathematics and Technology (NSB-05-133) (Attachment 2).

5. The Board approved Report of the National Science Board on the National Science Foundation’s Merit Review System (NSB-05-119).

6. The Board approved a policy statement on Respective Roles of NSF and OIG In the Settlement of Administrative Investigatory Matters (NSB-05-132) (Attachment 3).


9. The Board approved a recommendation by several Board Members to convene a series of workshops, drawing from key members of the research community and relevant Federal agencies, to examine the need for an integrated national effort to address major science questions related to hurricanes.

Attachment 1: NSB-05-114
Attachment 2: NSB-05-133
Attachment 3: NSB-05-132
Attachment 4: NSB-05-134
MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

SUBJECT: Closed Session Agenda Items for November 30-December 1, 2005 Meeting

The Government in the Sunshine Act requires formal action on closing portions of each Board meeting. The following are the closed session agenda items anticipated for the November 30-December 1, 2005 meeting.

1. Staff appointments
2. Future budgets
3. Grants and contracts
4. Specific Office of Inspector General investigations and enforcement actions
5. NSF participation in a civil or administrative action, proceeding, or arbitration

A proposed resolution and the General Counsel's certification for closing these portions of the meetings are attached for your consideration.

Michael P. Crosby
Executive Officer

Attachments
PROPOSED
RESOLUTION
TO CLOSE PORTIONS OF
389th MEETING
NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

RESOLVED: That the following portions of the meeting of the National Science Board (NSB) scheduled for November 30-December 1, 2005 shall be closed to the public.

1. Those portions having to do with discussions regarding nominees for appointments as National Science Board members and National Science Foundation (NSF) staff appointments, or with specific staffing or personnel issues involving identifiable individuals. An open meeting on these subjects would be likely to constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

2. Those portions having to do with future budgets not yet submitted by the President to the Congress.

3. Those portions having to do with proposals and awards for specific grants, contracts, or other arrangements. An open meeting on those portions would be likely to disclose personal information and constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. It would also be likely to disclose research plans and other related information that are trade secrets, and commercial or financial information obtained from a person that are privileged or confidential. An open meeting would also prematurely disclose the position of the NSF on the proposals in question before final negotiations and any determination by the Director to make the awards and so would be likely to frustrate significantly the implementation of the proposed Foundation action.

4. Those portions having to do with specific Office of the Inspector General investigations and enforcement actions, or agency audit guidelines.

5. Those portions having to do with NSF participation in a civil or administrative action, proceeding, or arbitration.

The Board finds that any public interest in an open discussion of these items is outweighed by protection of the interests asserted for closing the items.
CERTIFICATE

It is my opinion that portions of the meeting of the National Science Board (NSB) or its subdivisions scheduled for November 30-December 1, 2005 having to do with nominees for appointments as NSB members and National Science Foundation (NSF) staff, or with specific staffing or personnel issues or actions, may properly be closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (2) and (6); those portions having to do with future budgets may properly be closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (3) and 42 U.S.C. 1863(k); those portions having to do with proposals and awards for specific grants, contracts, or other arrangements may properly be closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (4), (6), and (9) (B); those portions disclosure of which would risk the circumvention of a statute or agency regulation under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (2); those portions having to do with specific Office of the Inspector General investigations and enforcement actions may properly be closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c) (5), (7) and (10); and those portions having to do with NSF participation in a civil or administrative action, proceeding, or arbitration may be properly closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c)(10).

Lawrence Rudolph
General Counsel
National Science Foundation
THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD COMMISSION ON 21ST CENTURY EDUCATION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS AND TECHNOLOGY

PREAMBLE

There is a growing dependence on science and technology around the world, and a growing investment in science and engineering workforce skills by governments of both developed and developing economies. In the U.S., the Federal Government has a long history of support for science, mathematics and technology education for two fundamental purposes: to advance the individual in our democratic society through the acquisition of knowledge and skills useful in the labor market and for full participation in American life; and to advance the Nation’s economy, national security, and quality of life through investment in national capabilities in science and engineering fields. As other governments have emulated successful U.S. strategies in science and engineering higher education, effective Federal strategies to support U.S. education in science, mathematics and technology have become more critical to sustaining our Nation’s preeminence in science and technology.

The National Science Board (NSB, the Board) was established with the National Science Foundation (NSF, the Foundation) by Federal statute in 1950 and assigned two broad areas of responsibility: (1) establishing the policies for and guiding the Foundation; and (2) serving as an advisor to the President and Congress on issues in science and engineering research and education. As part of the latter role, in 1982 the NSB established The Commission on Pre-college Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology that provided a “plan of action ... directed toward the Nation’s achieving world educational leadership (as measured by student achievement and participation levels and other non-subjective criteria) in mathematics, science and technology in elementary and secondary schools by the year 1995.”1 This report was coordinated with the 1983 report of the U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education report, A Nation At Risk, which raised national concern about the quality of pre-college education. Despite these two reports from two decades ago, one sounding the alarm the other focused on recommended solutions, we continue to slip further behind.

Subsequent reports and statements from eminent bodies representing the broad range of national interests in science and technology literacy in U.S. society and skills in the U.S. workforce continued to sound alarms concerning the condition of K-12 and K-16 education in science and technology areas. These included the U.S. House of Representatives Science Policy Study, Unlocking Our Future, 1998; the National Science Board, Preparing Our Children, 1999; the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century report to the Secretary of the Department of Education (the “Glen Commission” report) Before It’s Too Late, 2000; the Commission on National Security/21st Century, Road Map for National Security—Imperative for Change, 2001; and the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, Sustaining the Nation’s Innovation Ecosystem: Maintaining the Strength of Our Science & Engineering Capabilities, 2004; among others.

---

1 September 12, 1983 cover letter from The National Science Board Commission on Pre-college Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology to Lewis M. Branscomb, Chairman, National Science Board, Educating Americans for the 21st Century—A plan of action for improving mathematics, science and technology education for all American elementary and secondary students so that their achievement is the best in the world by 1995.
However, the 21st century is upon us and questions continue as to why the goals, recommendations and strategies provided by over 20 years of study and reports are yet to be fulfilled. Not since the Soviet Union’s launch of Sputnik satellite – 47 years ago – has the need to improve science and mathematics education in America been as clear and as urgent as it is today. The converging trends and stresses within our Nation’s system for educating students in mathematics, science and technology are clearly documented in the soon to be published NSB Report, Science and Engineering Indicators 2006. The rise of high technology economies around the globe—both developed and developing—underscores the urgency of finding solutions to what appears to be the intractable problem of raising U.S. student achievement to world class levels. We are becoming increasingly aware that the U.S. performance in science, mathematics and technology is not merely an issue of financial and physical resources but also of cultural factors. Among the poorest and the most affluent alike, cultural factors inhibit student interest in acquiring the base of knowledge and skills necessary to achieve and excel in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields, even while growing demand for technical skills by U.S. employers is evidenced by the absorption of a large number of foreign-born and foreign-educated S&T workers and the growing phenomenon of outsourcing of S&T work to other countries.

During recent congressional hearings, the Board was asked to re-constitute its 1982-83 Commission. A number of spokespersons for the science and engineering education communities have also urged the Board to undertake an effort similar to the 1982-1983 Commission. Congressional Appropriations report language for FY 2006 stated that they strongly endorse the Board taking steps to “…establish a commission to make recommendations for NSF and Federal Government action to achieve measurable improvements in the Nation’s science education at all levels”, and “expects the Board to provide an interim report by September 30, 2005, on the establishment of the commission, and to report the commission’s findings and recommendations to the Committee at the conclusion of the commission’s work” (H.R. Report 109-118).

The National Science Board is, therefore, initiating the process for establishing an NSB Commission on 21st Century Education in Science, Mathematics and Technology to formulate a national strategy for implementing an effective long-term approach to the well-known problems and opportunities of U.S. K-16 STEM education. This strategy must place special emphasis on educational transition points—in pre-college education and between high school and college, and during the college career, with special focus on the role of community colleges in STEM education. As part of its charge, the Commission will be asked to explicitly call out the role for NSF in the context of the larger, national K-16 STEM education system.

To guide the development of a final charge to the Commission, the National Science Board will undertake a series of hearings involving all stakeholder groups, in diverse locations throughout the Nation. These hearings will include spokespersons for employers, school systems, parents, students, academe, State and local government, professional organizations, and Federal agencies and policymakers with an interest in STEM education and the workforce.

AUTHORITY

Under 42 U.S.C. 1862 (d): “The Board and Director shall recommend and encourage the pursuit of national policies for the promotion of...education in science and engineering.” 42 U.S.C. 1863(h) authorizes the Board “to establish such special commissions as it may from time to time deem necessary for the purposes of this chapter.” The NSB Commission on 21st Century Education in Science, Mathematics, and Technology is governed by the NSF Act of 1950, as amended, the Federal Advisory Committee Act and other current regulations, including conflict-of-interest regulations of the National Science Foundation and the Sunshine Act for meetings of the National Science Board.
POTENTIAL PURPOSE AND FUNCTION
The Commission will make recommendations to the Nation through the National Science Board for a bold new approach or approaches to address the Nation’s needs, with specific emphasis on the role of the NSF in such approach or approaches. In doing so, it will be necessary to summarize the health of primary and secondary school science, mathematics and technology education in the U.S. and its interconnections in these fields with the higher education system, including community colleges; teacher education; and social and cultural factors. To carry out this mission, the Commission must develop an understanding of the roles and potential of groups, organizations and institutions in the process, including but not limited to: Federal, State and local government agencies; parents, teachers and students; colleges—including community colleges, universities, museums and other agents of formal and informal education outside the K-16 systems; industry; and professional, labor and public interest organizations and seek to assure their involvement and cooperation during the life of the Commission and concern for science education after the termination of the Commission.

In developing their recommendations, the Commission will determine how NSF can contribute to:

- Improving the quality of K-12 education related to both general and pre-professional training in mathematics, engineering and the sciences, including, but not limited to: the availability of competent teachers; the adequacy and currency of curricula, materials, and facilities; standards and trends in performance, as well as promotion, graduation and higher-education entrance requirements; and comparison with performance and procedures of other countries.

- Identifying critical aspects in the entry, selection, education and exploitation of the full range of potential talents, with special attention to transition points during the educational career where loss of students is greatest; and recommend means to assure the most effective education of all U.S. students as well as future scientists, engineers and other technical personnel.

- Improving mathematics and science programs, curricula, and pedagogy as a means of capitalizing on the Nation’s investment in educational research and development; and appropriate models of exemplary education programs in other countries;

- Promulgating a set of principles, options and education strategies which can be employed by all concerned, nationwide, to improve the quality of secondary school mathematics and science education in the 21st Century, as an agenda for promoting American economic strength, national security, employment opportunities, and social progress that will support U.S. pre-eminence in discovery and innovation.

MEMBERSHIP AND STRUCTURE
The Commission on Education in Mathematics, Science, Engineering and Technology will consist of between twelve (12) and fifteen (15) members appointed by the Chairman of the National Science Board, in consultation with the full Board, the Executive Branch, Congress and other stakeholders, and who will include a representative of the pre-college system with in depth experience, such as a superintendent of a major school system. The NSB Chairman will designate a chairperson and vice chairperson from among the members. No more than three Commission members will be appointed from current Board membership. Commission members will be persons whose wisdom, knowledge, abilities, vision and national stature can promote an objective examination of mathematics, science and technology education in the K-16 system and develop a bold new national strategy for the 21st century.
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A quorum of the commission will be a majority of its members.

Terms of service of members will end with the termination of the Commission.

Hearings on behalf of the Commission may be held by one or more members with the authorization of the chairperson.

The Commission may establish such working groups as it deems appropriate. Each working group may be composed of such individuals as the Commission deems appropriate, but at least one member of each working group shall be a member of the Commission. Each working group will be chaired by a Commission member. Standing committees will act under policies established by the Commission, in accordance with FACA and other applicable statutes and regulations. Each working group will present to the Commission findings and recommendations for consideration by the Commission. Timely notification of the establishment of a working group and any change therein, including its charge, membership and frequency of meetings will be made in writing to the Executive Secretary or his/her designee.

Management (including Executive Secretary and Designated Official) and staff services will be provided by the Board Office under the direct supervision of the Board’s Executive Officer.

MEETINGS
The Commission will meet at the call of the chairperson, with advance approval of the National Science Board or the Designated Official, who will approve the agenda and will be present or represented at all meetings. Standing committees will meet as required at the call of their chairperson with the concurrence of the Commission chairperson. Meetings will be conducted, and records of proceedings will be kept, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

In accordance with the NSF Act and other applicable laws, Commission members and standing committee members not members of the Commission shall be entitled to compensation equal to that permitted in NSF Bulletin No. 00-13 for official business of the Commission. Their per diem and travel expenses will be paid in accordance to Federal Travel Regulations.

REPORTS
The Commission will develop an action plan that includes a plan for dissemination and outreach over the entire Commission process, with results to appear at 6-month intervals and a final set of findings and recommendations to coincide with an anticipated 18-month active life. The action plan will identify specific responsibilities of the Foundation, other Federal agencies, State government, local school districts, private foundations, business and industry, professional associations, scientific organization, and citizens interested in improving education in mathematics, science and technology for our Nation’s children. In addition to its final report, which is expected 18 months from the initial meeting, the Commission will submit to the National Science Board periodic progress reports at a minimum of 6-month intervals.

Warren M. Washington
Chairman
National Science Board Policy Statement:  
Respective Roles of NSF and OIG  
In the Settlement of Administrative Investigatory Matters

The National Science Board (the Board) encourages the Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the management of NSF to continue cooperative efforts to resolve and bring closure to OIG investigations involving administrative settlement and/or compliance agreements in accordance with the statutory and fiduciary responsibilities of each. When OIG refers investigations to the Department of Justice (DOJ), and DOJ subsequently proposes the use of such settlement and/or compliance agreements, OIG will consult with NSF representatives on the investigative findings to-date and DOJ’s proposed action. OIG will then discuss with DOJ the joint recommendations of OIG and NSF. Thereafter, NSF and OIG will work cooperatively to protect the interests of the government. Therefore, the Board establishes this as Board policy regarding the resolution of such matters. NSF and OIG are urged to collaboratively develop, and incorporate into appropriate internal guidance documents, written procedures that will govern the implementation of this policy statement.

The Board also recognizes that many OIG investigations uncover matters that, when presented by OIG to NSF, could be best resolved by NSF under the authority of the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act (PFCRA) of 1986, 31 U.S.C. 3801, if NSF were included in that statute’s provisions. The Board fully supports the past efforts that both OIG and NSF have undertaken to amend PFCRA to afford NSF the investigative resolution authorities provided other federal agencies. The Board will request that the Congress secure PFCRA authorities for NSF.
Charge to the Task Force on International Science

Statutory Basis
"The Board shall render to the President for submission to the Congress reports on specific, individual policy matters related to science and engineering and education in science engineering, as the Board, the President, or the Congress determines the need for such reports." (42 U.S.C. Section 1863) SEC. 4. (j) (2)

Action Recommended
The National Science Board (NSB, the Board) will examine the role of the U.S. Government in international science and engineering in response to the changes that have occurred in recent years to the global dynamics for science and engineering (S&E) research, education, politics, and technical workforce.

Background
In September 2001, the Board released a report entitled, Towards a More Effective Role for the U.S. Government in International Science and Engineering (NSB-01-187). Many of the recommendations from this report remain valid, and are largely unfulfilled. Since the time this report was prepared, there have also been considerable shifts in the international landscape. These shifts, along with the unfulfilled recommendations of the 2001 report, warrant a careful reexamination of the role of the U.S. Government in international S&E to address the many changes that have occurred in the global S&E dynamics related to research, education, politics, and technical workforce.

Policy Objectives
The ad hoc Task Group on International Science recommends that the Board approve the creation of a formal Task Force on International Science under the Committee on Programs and Plans (CPP). The following issues will be analyzed and discussed before constructive policy recommendations are brought to CPP and the full Board:

- Facilitating partnerships between U.S. and non-U.S. scientists and engineers in the U.S.
- Facilitating partnerships between U.S. and non-U.S. scientists and engineers outside the U.S. in both developed and developing countries
- Utilization of (S&E) partnerships for improving relations between countries.
- Utilization of (S&E) partnerships for improving quality of life and environmental protection in developing countries.

The role of U.S. and international students will be considered throughout all task force activities. As the world of scientific research becomes increasingly global and intensely competitive, it is important to establish an environment for future generations of researchers to perform in a more “globally aware” manner. Future generations of researchers will need to be more cognizant of, and be able to successfully address, the various international and cultural issues that may influence the development and implementation of S&E partnerships; issues which current
generations have been fairly insulated. Even U.S. scientists who have been active internationally in the past, may not be fully aware of the complexity of functioning in a rapidly changing and highly competitive world because they have often been the lead or "controlling" entity in previous partnerships.

U.S. Federal agencies currently fund a wide range of international (S&E) partnerships that support both basic and applied research, with NSF programs seeking to ensure that U.S. institutions and scientists are globally engaged and able to more fully advance their research via international collaboration. The task force will examine the experiences of various U.S. Government supported international S&E partnership programs with respect to their effectiveness in furthering research advancements, and their experience in utilizing S&E partnerships as vehicles for achieving more than research advances (i.e., improved relationships between countries; capacity building; and environmental awareness). While particular interest will be on the level of inter-agency coordination, and more specifically the role of NSF in both facilitating and directly supporting (S&E) partnerships outside the U.S., the task force will also examine international S&E partnership activities as they interplay with science policy, foreign policy and domestic policy objectives.

The task force will consult with science officials from other agencies and around the world as well as representatives of both U.S. and international science communities, to better understand a wide range of perspectives on the role of government in supporting international S&E partnerships that specifically address the issues identified above. The task force will also interact with other Federal agencies to understand how they may or may not have utilized the findings and recommendations made in the Board’s 2001 report on international S&E.

Logistics
The task force will seek to bring together NSB Members, members of the international scientific community, U.S. Federal agency representatives, and NSF staff (along with representatives from the NSF Advisory Committee for International Science and Engineering). The NSB Office will serve as the focal point for coordination and implementation of all task force activities.

A series of workshops will be held during 2005-2006 to address the issues identified above. In addition, the task force will convene such working groups as it deems necessary to obtain relevant information. It is anticipated that the task force will produce a final report that synthesizes the contributions from its own deliberations, workshops, and working groups and present recommendations regarding the role of the U.S. Government in international S&E, with specific recommendations for NSF policy in supporting international science partnerships. Printed copies of a final NSB report will be widely distributed and available on the NSB Web site for the public, universities, the Congress, various special interest groups, and the broad scientific community. However, a regular and pro-active outreach effort to communicate task force activities will be implemented throughout the duration of the task force life. The task force expects to conclude its activities within 2 years from the date that formation of the task force is approved.