



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE  
**Humanities**  
FIFTY YEARS

## NEH Panelist Survey

**Introduction to this Survey:** Traditionally, the NEH has done the bulk of its peer review panels **in-person**. That is, panelists travel to Washington and participate in a face-to-face meeting. Recently, we have begun to experiment with **remote** panels, including some conducted via telephone conference call and some via a video-conferencing system.

As a panelist who has served on both types of panels (in-person and remote) we are keen to get your frank opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of each and understand how we can improve the panelist experience.

To that end, we would be grateful if you would respond to the following questions, which we expect to take about fifteen minutes.

Thank you!

OMB #: 3136-0140, Exp: 12/31/2018

### Public Burden Statement

The Office of Management and Budget requires federal agencies to supply information on the time needed to complete forms and also to invite comments on the paperwork burden. NEH estimates that the average time to complete this survey is fifteen minutes per response. This estimate includes time for reviewing instructions, gathering the information needed, and completing and reviewing the survey.

Please send any comments regarding the estimated completion time or any other aspect of this survey, including suggestions for reducing the completion time, to Brett Bobley at [bbobley@neh.gov](mailto:bbobley@neh.gov), or to National Endowment for the Humanities, Attn: Office of Digital Humanities 400 Seventh Street, S.W., Washington, DC 20506. You are not required to respond to this collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB number.

\* 1. Your **remote panel** was of what type?

\* 2. Prior to the panel discussion, what appealed to you about participating in an **in-person** panel in DC? If there were any negatives, what were they?

\* 3. Prior to the panel discussion, what appealed to you about participating in **remote (video or phone)** panel? If there were any negatives, what were they?

\* 4. Did the panel format (in person vs. remote) signal to you that one review was more important to the NEH than the other?

If Yes, please explain.

\* 5. Did you prepare differently for an in-person panel than for a remote panel?

If Yes, please explain.

6. During each type of panel meeting, did you want more, less, or "OK as is" for each of the following?

	In-Person Panel	Remote Panel
Time to convey your thoughts fully?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
To hear others' thoughts fully?	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organic discussion among fellow panelists	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Direction from the panel chair (e.g. being asked specific questions, being called upon)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Time to discuss each proposal	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Time to discuss more proposals (That is, do you think some did not get discussed that could have been a contender for funding OR did the discussion include too many that did not seem fundable?)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Comments?

\* 7. What was the best part of their **in-person** discussion? What, if anything, hindered the in-person discussion?

\* 8. What was the best part of their **remote** discussion? What, if anything, hindered the remote discussion?

\* 9. In your opinion, was the quality of the review equal for applications going to both in-person and remote panels? Please explain.

\* 10. One goal of a panel, in addition to adjudicating applications, is to cultivate the understanding of current work in the humanities and at the NEH. For example, we hope that a panel may help a junior scholar learn about the grant process or help panelists and NEH staff refresh their knowledge of humanities fields. Do either of the panel methods (in person vs. remote) better facilitate this? Please describe.

11. Do you have any suggestions for how NEH could improve either remote or in person panels?