

Attendance: {please let me know if you've been missed in this list}

Committee:

Present: Prisca C, Jim B., Angela O., Todd H., James L., Keivan S., Brad P.

Agency:

Present: Jim W., Arik P., Jonathan R., Kathy T., Erik L., Hashima H

TOPIC 1: We first reviewed the list of possible survey questions provided by James L.
[[These notes capture most, but perhaps not all comments.]]

General:

The survey can address some topics the agencies cannot.

Focus is not on graduate students, send survey to full members of AAS

Include APS/DAP (Angela will help with this) but mostly after AAS initial work

Needs to ask not too many, too specific questions

Needs to balance objective and subjective questions

Need to keep the survey as simple as we can

Use a 5-point scale

Include a 'comment' box in some of the individual sections to get open responses

We need to be clear about what answers we want at the end

Purpose – link statistical information to impacts on individuals

Purpose – figure out how to lower the over-subscription rate

Purpose – we want to look at trends, not just a snapshot

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Career

Ask the science discipline of the respondent

Ask gender

Employment – maybe ask “are you looking for a different job”

– maybe ask “are you looking for a [more permanent] job in astronomy?”

Ask how many grants/contracts are needed to support the respondent

Ask how ‘cross disciplinary’ are you? I.e. do you propose to multiple science areas?

Section 3: Grant history

Agencies – be more specific about divisions, i.e. NASA Planetary, NSF GEO

Time scale – 5 year time scale is generally good.

Instead of asking about \$ amount, ask for % of time requested

In ‘reason’ question – include ‘other’ and include ‘support technical staff’ options’ perhaps distinguish primary and secondary reasons

Combine the ‘implicit’/‘explicit’ questions

Ask if respondent is eligible to submit proposals at their institution

While not wanting to burden, we are interested in trends of application/success history – ask for most recent year as well as 3 or 5 years ago or ask for yearly history??

Ask “Is writing proposals more burdensome now than in the past?”

Ask “Are you spending more [or too much?] time writing proposals?”

Ask “Are you spending more [or too much?] time reviewing proposals?”

Make sure we focus on ‘step 2’ or ‘final’ proposals rather than step 1 or preproposal

Ask something about the reaction to having preproposals, i.e. ‘step 1’ and ‘step 2’ proposals

Section 4: Effect of success rate

Do you resubmit similar proposals to multiple programs? [seldom, sometimes, frequently]

Do you resubmit proposals in subsequent years? [seldom, sometimes, frequently]

Does resubmitting proposals work?

We ask specifically about one solution to over-subscription (limiting proposal numbers); should we ask about other solutions? Probably, but might be complex if we go too far.

We should add additional comment boxes

For at least some boxes, introduce with specific things that we might want to be considered as responses.

Ask “Are you submitting more proposals”?

Ask “Is there a problem for you or for someone else in your group specifically related to proposal success rates?”

TOPIC 2: Summary and Appendix

Please provide your feedback to Prisca on the draft summary section for the AAAC report (sooner rather than later) and on the Appendix information for the report. Prisca will edit the summary section, so provide comments to her. For appendix, please feel free to take and edit sections and then return them to Prisca for incorporation.

Appendix: [[https://zzz.physics.umn.edu/lowrad/_media/aaac/aaac_appendix.pdf]]

Most people liked the general scope and length of the appendix

Liaisons (see below) should provide input/section edit to Prisca

NSF/AST – James

NSF/Particles – Angela (with Jim)

NSF/GEO – Todd

DOE – Kathy (will try)

NASA Astro – Brad (with Hashima)

NASA Planetary – Jim B (with Jonathan)

Helio – Todd (with Arik)

Specific Sections

We probably have the most data from NSF astronomy – do we need additional info? Or rather, how much additional data do we need?

Please comment on ‘impacts on agencies section’ for the appendix

Would be nice to know a ‘cost to review’ dollar amount for a proposal; perhaps give a ‘cost per panel’ or something sensible.

For ‘impacts on researchers’ just add a short section describing survey and include a couple of the questions

Quality / Figure of merit section – We have something from NASA Astro – do we need more? Try to generalize (all NASA division are similar but not identical) so use NASA Astro as an example