

# Reviewer Survey

May 2016 v3

**Panel reviewers:** *All questions in the survey refer to your experience as a panel reviewer \_\_\_\_\_ for the \_\_\_\_\_ [NSF program name] in 2015.<sup>1</sup>*

**Ad hoc reviewers:** *All questions in the survey refer to your experience as a reviewer of \_\_\_\_\_ [proposal info] \_\_\_\_\_ for the \_\_\_\_\_ [NSF program name] in 2015.<sup>2</sup>*

## RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

**Panel reviewers for preliminary and full proposals, ad hoc reviewers**

Which of the following best describes your current academic rank?

- Postdoctoral fellow
- Research scientist
- Adjunct professor
- Assistant professor
- Associate professor
- Full professor
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

What is your tenure status?

- Tenure-tracked or equivalent, but not yet tenured
- Tenured or equivalent
- Not tenure-tracked

Have you ever been a PI or Co-PI on a preliminary proposal submitted to core programs in the Division of Environmental Biology (DEB) or the Division of Integrative Organismal Systems (IOS)?

- Yes → A
- No
- Unsure

A. Have you ever been PI or Co-PI on an award from the core programs in DEB or IOS stemming from a preliminary proposal?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

---

<sup>1</sup> This information will be preloaded and visible to respondent

<sup>2</sup> This information will be preloaded and visible to respondent

## WORKLOAD

### Panel reviewers for preliminary and full proposals

Please complete the following information about this panel experience. Do not include travel and panel meeting time in your estimates.

Review format: Was your participation in the panel primarily in-person or through virtual meeting technologies?	Approximate number of reviewers on the panel, including yourself	Number of proposals assigned to you for review (N)	Approximate number of hours you spent per review prior to the panel meeting (H)	Total number of hours you spent on all reviews prior to panel meeting (T=N*H)
<input type="checkbox"/> Virtual <input type="checkbox"/> In-person	_____	_____	_____	

### Panel reviewers for preliminary proposals

How would you compare the time and effort to review each preliminary proposal to a full proposal? On average, a preliminary proposal took approximately...

- ¼ of the time or less to review
- ½ of the time to review
- The same time to review
- 25% more time to review
- 50% more time to review
- 100% more time to review
- More than twice the amount of time to review

### Ad hoc reviewers for full proposals

Approximately how many hours did it take you to review this proposal [pre-load proposal info]?

\_\_\_\_\_

## SATISFACTION WITH THE PROPOSALS

### Panel reviewers for preliminary and full proposals

How satisfied were you with the proposals reviewed by your panel in terms of...

	Not at all satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Do not recall/do not know
Intellectual merit						
Broader impact						
Potential to advance your field						
Potential to transform your field						

Approximately what fraction of the proposals reviewed by your panel had the following characteristics?

	10% or less	One-fourth	One-third	One-half	Two-thirds	> Two-thirds	Do not recall
Addressed a significant question/problem/opportunity							
Clearly conveyed the idea and approach							
Presented an approach that was feasible and appropriate							
Contained convincing preliminary data							
Could be characterized as high-risk/high-reward							
Demonstrated that investigators had the requisite expertise							
Were collaborative and/or interdisciplinary							

What percentage of the proposals reviewed by your panel was clearly not worth funding?  
\_\_\_\_\_ percent

- Do not recall/do not know

**Ad hoc reviewers for full proposals**

Did this proposal have the following characteristics?

Addressed a significant research question/problem/opportunity	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clearly conveyed the idea and approach	<input type="checkbox"/>
Presented an approach that was feasible and appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contained convincing preliminary data	<input type="checkbox"/>
Could be characterized as high-risk/high-reward	<input type="checkbox"/>
Demonstrated that investigators had the requisite expertise	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was collaborative and/or interdisciplinary	<input type="checkbox"/>
Was clearly worth funding	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Panel reviewers for preliminary proposals**

Was the 4-page Project Description narrative sufficient for you to evaluate the proposed idea and approach?

- Yes
- No

How many pages would you recommend as optimal for the Project Description section in a preliminary proposal?  
\_\_\_\_\_ pages

**Panel and ad hoc reviewers for full proposals**

Was the 15-page Project Description narrative sufficient for you to evaluate the proposed idea and approach?

- Yes
- No

How many pages would you recommend as optimal for the Project Description section in a full proposal?

\_\_\_\_\_ pages

**SATISFACTION WITH THE REVIEW**

**Panel reviewers for preliminary and full proposals**

What is your level of satisfaction with the following....

	Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very satisfied
Number of proposals you were assigned to review					
Quality of written reviews by other panelists/ad hoc reviewers					
Rigor of proposal discussion in panel					
Balance in the reviewers' consideration of proposal strengths and weaknesses					
Willingness of other reviewers to support high-risk/high-reward projects					
Fairness of final panel ratings					
Level of consensus among the reviewers					
Quality of panel summaries					
Review process overall					

**Panel reviewers for preliminary and full proposals, ad hoc reviewers for full proposals**

Please describe one change you would make to the merit review process.

\_\_\_\_\_

- I would not make any changes