**Minutes from Oct 2, 2015 Compiled by P. Cushman on Oct 4**

Attending: Prisca Cushman, Todd Hoeksema, James Lowenthal, Bradley Peterson, Keivan G. Stassun, Ted von Hippel

Absent: (?) Chryssa Kouveliotou

The Interim Report is now posted on the AAAC website for the Nov 12 meeting agenda. Now that it is official, we decided to submit Interim report to the ArXiv and to send a letter to the SSB with the report attached, in order to make sure it is in the hands of the mid-decadal review process, plus to offer our services if they would like a presentation on it. (N.B. This was done by Oct 4)

Prisca and Todd have both given presentations to various boards, and Keivan will be giving a talk next week. Prisca reorganized the front page of the wiki and created a main location for all such slides (.pptx Format) in order to freely share this resource.

The next step is to split into 2 main groups with separate teleconference schedules. A new survey needs to be designed to get at some of the more difficult questions and to (hopefully) provide a larger statistical sample. The point people for the survey are James, Todd, and Ted. Prisca will put together a doodle poll. The first meeting will be very soon – hopefully next week. Jobs will be assigned, and the next meeting may be a month further down the road. The second group will be working on defining further statistics that can be accumulated with help from the agencies. Prisca will lead this work – it may start with individual calls to agency contacts. Meanwhile, the presentations over the next month (see agenda for details) will provide feedback and we should be compiling the ideas and questions that arise, as part of defining the next step. In addition, we should be open to new members. Prisca will make a special plea at the AAAC meeting for some new AAAC members to be active in this.

A more broad ranging discussion then ensued, from which the following ideas for extensions to the report emerged.

1. We should bring the level of detail up on some of the fields to the same level as exists for others. Specifically, Heliophysics demographics (who is writing the reports, where are they from) may be interesting since there are more people from small companies - differences include more soft money, less overhead, more support per grant.

2. Along this line – what is the impact of universities having more of an emphasis on teaching. Is this changing the number/urgency of seeking federal grants?

3. The impact on agencies should also be enlarged to include helio and planetary.

4. It may take less time to do a repeat proposal. Also a repeat proposal is often better in the end, due to feedback from the reviewers. There are a number of systematic issues related to this. Can we clarify the effects?

5. There was a comment that reducing the length of proporsals from 15 🡺 10 pages could be a suggested remedy, but in fact, it may be harder to write a shorter proposal. It would reduce the load on reviewers though.

6. There were questions about whether the growth in number of proposals mirrors the growth in the community - tied to the number of members in AAS. This was a calculation based on removing estimated numbers of repeat proposals from the number of individual proposers. It is confusing to the reader, but also may not be valid – certainly it does not track in detail since there are lots more proposals coming in during the period from 2005-2010, what happened then?

7. The National Academies put out a report 10-15 years ago where they also claimed that we should not be dipping below a 30-35% success rate. We should locate this report and incorporate it.

8. We should try to document the anecdotal information on people leaving the field. Or leaving the US to move to countries (e.g. Australia) with better funding in Astro.

9. Sharpen the case for highly reviewed proposals going unfunded. Need more data from NASA, similar to what we have but for more years. We also need to find another way to get at this if possible. The main problem is stability in the merit scales. Members of the HST panel believed a majority of the proposals were very good and they had to rescale in order to get spread them out between 1-5.

10. Europeans do not need funding in order to propose a study using archival data, but US does – can we compare past US proposals for archival data to European and find a way to compare science output? This might be promising… who volunteers to follow up on it? In general – can we consider a way to define a control group which can be compared to another pool in order to quantify merit or science output as a function of proposal funding rate or availability of funding overall. Is a country comparison useful?

11. Can we request that the agencies provide a set of questions to reviewers and panels at the time of the review to answer questions like “how many more proposals did you review that were of almost equal merit to those that were just above the funding line?” This would take some careful thought to make the questions reliable , but we could ask the agencies if they think this might be useful going forward.