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Total Responses: 489

Obvious non-US responses were scrubbed from this analysis, resulting in a total of 446 responses of which 62 did not provide identification. Of these last, 29 were from IPs traceable to identifiable US institutional servers, the remainder coming from gmail-type servers or not identifiable.

Responses from scientists at 130 identifiable institutions were received. The top respondent institutions were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planetary Science Institute</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Propulsion Laboratory</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Research Institute</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHU/APL</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA GSFC</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA JSC</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA ARC</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETI Institute</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Science Institute</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. Year of terminal degree (e.g., Ph.D.)

Min: 1953
Max: 2015 (graduate student)
Median: 1997
Mean: 1994

48 interpreted the question as terminal degree (e.g., PhD).
Q3. Are you the current PI of a PSD research grant?

Yes (273) 61.3%
No (172) 38.7%
No response (1)

Q4. Have you ever been PI of a PSD research grant?

Yes (321) 72.0%
No (125) 28.0%

Two answering No had said they were the current PI of a PSD research grant.
Q5. Have you ever served on a NASA PSD review panel?

Yes (318) 71.6%
No  (126) 28.4%

Of the 126 responding No, 45 have been PIs (14% of that group) and 30 were current PIs (11% of that group).
Of the 318 responding Yes, 40 have never been a PI. Most of these are recent PhDs, the remainder have been almost wholly funded by mission funding.
Q6. What percentage of your time is supported by your institution, e.g., government, teaching faculty, etc.?

37% of respondents are 100% soft-money.

64% are supported by their institutions 50% or less.

Of those supported 75% or more by their institutions,

72% are from universities,
16% from government labs,
4% from JPL
and the rest from corporations and non-profits.

Of the respondents who are 100% soft-money,

40% are from non-profits
38% are from universities
10% are from JPL
12% are from government labs
Q7. What percentage of your time is supported by active missions (including participating scientist, but not including data analysis programs)?

- 60% of respondents receive no mission funding.
- 28% of respondents receive 2-50% of their funding from missions.
- 12% of respondents receive >50% of their funding from missions.

Of those receiving more than 50% of their funding from missions,
- 15% are at government labs
- 13% are at APL
- 24% are at JPL
- 20% are at other universities
- 27% are at non-profits and other corporations
Q8. What percentage of your time is supported by research and data analysis grants?

44% of respondents funded half-time or greater by R&A grants. 17% fully-funded and 18% not funded by R&A grants.

A greater fraction of R&A funding correlates with earlier career researchers, within about 15 years of PhD.
Q9. What percentage of your time do you usually seek to cover in a single grant proposal?

Ranges averaged for plotting (e.g., 20-30 -> 25).
Q10. What is the maximum percentage of a soft-money researcher's salary that he or she should normally expect to cover with a single grant?
Q11. Should grants be limited in duration to 3 years?

No (385) 87%
Yes (58) 13%

[Note: the preliminary version of this report had the results reversed in error.]

Q12. What is the optimum duration of a grant (total years)?
Q13. How might research and data analysis programs be restructured to decrease the burden of numerous review panels while retaining the integrity of the review process? Create fewer programs? Increase grant sizes and duration? Something else? Some combination of things?

380 responses (J. Castillo-Rogez presentation)
Q14. External reviewers are typically selected on the basis of expert knowledge of the area covering the subject of a research proposal. How many external reviews should a proposal be given?

Ranges were averaged (e.g., 3-5 -> 4).
Q15. Program Officers make proposal funding recommendations to the PSD Director, Jim Green, based on peer reviews and scores given by review panels as well as other considerations. Factors regarding programmatic balance and health can also influence selections. These factors should include (select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a range of sub-disciplines within the program</td>
<td>(343) 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued support for a PI or research group long supported by the program</td>
<td>(156) 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing in some number of PIs new to the program</td>
<td>(315) 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk/high payoff</td>
<td>(245) 57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scores provided by review panels should be the sole basis for awards</td>
<td>(59) 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Factors (154 Responses, J. Castillo-Rogez presentation)</td>
<td>(154) 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q16. Are NASA proposal reviews useful to restructuring your proposal to make it fundable in a future submission? If not, please comment on how reviews could be improved.

371 Responses.

Q17. General comments?

260 Responses.

(J. Castillo-Rogez presentation)