

# **COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION**

## **Findings and Proposed Recommendations**

### ***1. Finding***

**Program Officers and the Planetary Community are stretch “thin” in the preparation and review of proposals**

### ***Proposed Recommendation***

**Pressure on the proposal process is best dealt with by increasing grant size duration up to 5 years if fully justified and applied ~ uniformly in PSD (reviewers needs to “adjust” thinking to accept this)**

# **COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION**

## **Findings and Recommendations**

### ***2. Finding***

**The proposal process needs to be more “transparent” with better communication with proposers especially from the Program Officers on the status of the process**

### ***Proposed Recommendation***

**Publish the standards used and a table giving the approximate dates when all review panels will meet and dates when proposers will hear the results**

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *3. Finding*

**Most survey respondents felt that PIs should be able to cover up to 50% of their salary in a single proposal; some felt that 100% is reasonable, if justified**

### *Proposed Recommendation*

**TBD**

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *4. Finding*

Quality and usefulness of summary reviews to proposers are inconsistent across programs and from year to year within *Planetary Sciences Division*

### *Proposed Recommendation*

Establish uniform reviewer and summary review forms for all Division programs and publish annually

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *5. Finding*

**Some PIs propose for > 3 years, but are funded for less time; but they are often not informed of the reason for the shorter duration**

### *Proposed Recommendation*

**The standard PSD summary form should include a section that explains the justification for the shorter duration**

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *6. Finding*

The identification of qualified panel members and external reviewers is difficult. Some programs “socialize” new people into the community by having graduate students (?) or new post-docs serve on their panel(s)

### *Proposed Recommendation*

**Solicitation of qualified panelists and reviewers should be made routinely (by Jim Green?) through announcements, such as in PEN**

**Post-docs (and grad students?) can serve as aides on panels and observe the process; they (should or should not?) be reviewers**

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *7. Finding*

**Some (all?) programs provide an honorarium to**

**review panelists**  
*Proposed Recommendation*

**PSD should have a uniform policy (is there already?)  
for having an honorarium, and the rates should be  
uniform within the Division**

# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Observations

### *8. Observation*

**Unofficial notification from HQ of review results  
often too late to be useful!**  
*Proposed Recommendation (?)*

**TBD**



# COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

## Findings and Recommendations

### *9. Finding*

**Most (all?) programs call for a Notice of Intent (NOI), but it is optional. NOIs help in planning reviews and organizing panels**

*Proposed Recommendation*

**Responding to NOIs (should or should not?) be required**

# **COMMUNITY SURVEY AND WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION**

## **Findings and Recommendations**

### ***10. Finding***

**Many of the RA/SRT activities have evolved over the years, but do not appear to be evaluated “across the board” on any regular basis**

### ***Proposed Recommendation***

**Recognize the need for division-wide coordination and evaluation of SRT programs by NASA and community and hold a “Senior Review” at least every 10 years**