Appendix A. 2019 Merit Review Survey

A. Survey Introduction

Welcome

Intro: Thank you for your participation. This survey is designed to help NSF understand the factors that affect researchers as they submit proposals to or review proposals for NSF, and the impact of various approaches to proposal review. Your responses will help NSF to improve its service to the community of proposers and reviewers.

The results will be reported in such a way that no single individual can be identified. Your response is voluntary. Your decision to participate or not to participate in this survey will not adversely affect consideration of your pending or future proposals.

This survey should take about 20 minutes to complete.

If you have any difficulty taking this survey, please contact surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com for assistance.

Please scroll down and click the blue "Forward" arrow to proceed with the survey.

Paperwork Burden Statement

OMB: This information is collected under the authority of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 3145-0215. The time required to complete this voluntary information collection is estimated to average 20 minutes, including the time to review instructions, and complete and review responses. If you have any comments or concerns about the contents or the status of your individual submission of this questionnaire, e-mail surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com, or write directly to: Merit Review Survey, Insight Policy Research, 1901 N. Moore Street, Suite 1100, Arlington, VA 22209.

About This Survey

Main_Intro: This survey consists of three sections. The first asks about your experiences as someone who has **reviewed** proposals for NSF (if applicable), the second asks about your experiences as someone who has **submitted** proposals to NSF (if applicable), and the third contains questions that will help NSF understand how experiences may vary between subgroups and career stages. Someone who submits a proposal to NSF, a proposer, is also called a Principal Investigator (PI).

Q1_Intro. For the purpose of this survey, please do not count post-doctoral fellowship applications or student fellowship applications as proposals.

Q1A. *Since October 1, 2015, have you reviewed a proposal for NSF, other than a post-doctoral or student fellowship application?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Q1B. *Since October 1, 2015, have you submitted a proposal to NSF, other than a post-doctoral or student fellowship application? (Do not include your experience as a co-investigator.)

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

[If answers to both Q1A and Q1B are 'No', thank them for their participation, and exit.]

Q2A-C. Since October 1, 2015, with which NSF Directorate(s) and Division(s) have your scholarly activities been most closely affiliated? (Note: If your work aligns with more than one, select up to three Directorate/Division combinations in the drop-down menus below.)

Q2A1. Directorate 1
Q2A2. Division 1
Q2B1. Directorate 2
Q2B2. Division 2
Q2C1. Directorate 3
Q2C2. Division 3

Drop-down list of NSF Directorates:
1, BIO = Biological Sciences
2, CISE = Computer & Information Science & Engineering
3, EHR = Education & Human Resources
4, ENG = Engineering
5, GEO = Geosciences
6, MPS = Mathematical & Physical Sciences
7, SBE = Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences
-8 = Skip
-9 = Missing

Drop-down list of NSF Divisions:
1, DBI = Biological Infrastructure
2, DEB = Environmental Biology
3, IOS = Integrative Organismal Systems

4, MCB = Molecular & Cellular Biosciences
5, OAC = Office of Advanced Cyberinfrastructure (formerly, Division of Advanced Cyberinfrastructure)
6, CNS = Computer & Networking Systems
7, CCF = Computing & Communication Foundations
8, IIS = Information & Intelligent Systems
9, DGE = Graduate Education
10, HRD = Human Resource Development
11, DRL = Research on Learning in Formal & Informal Settings
12, DUE = Undergraduate Education
13, CBET = Chemical, Bioengineering, Environmental, and Transport Systems
14, CMMI = Civil, Mechanical & Manufacturing Innovation
15, ECCS = Electrical, Communications & Cyber Systems
16, EEC = Engineering Education & Centers
17, IIP = Industrial Innovation & Partnerships
18, AGS = Atmospheric & Geospace Sciences
19, EAR = Earth Sciences
20, OCE = Ocean Sciences
21, PLR = Office of Polar Programs (formerly, Division of Polar Programs)
22, AST = Astronomical Sciences
23, CHE = Chemistry
24, DMR = Materials Research
25, DMS = Mathematical Sciences
26, PHY = Physics
27, BCS = Behavioral & Cognitive Sciences
28, SES = Social & Economic Sciences
29, Other organization unit; list here _____
-8 = Skip
-9 = Missing

[If "No" selected for Q1A, and "Yes" for Q1B, skip to PI_Intro [i.e. jump to questions for investigators.]

[If "Yes" selected for Q1A, continue to Reviewer_Intro.]

[Visible only if answered "Yes" to question 1A; if "No" is selected for 1A, skip to PI_Intro]

B. Experiences as a Reviewer

Reviewer_Intro: The following questions ask about your experiences reviewing NSF proposals. For these questions, please use the definitions below.

There are two types of reviewers:

- An **ad hoc reviewer** is someone who submits a written review of a proposal but does not participate in a discussion of the proposal with other reviewers.
- A **panelist, or panel reviewer**, is someone who participates in a discussion of a proposal (usually more than one proposal) with other reviewers. A panelist may or may not prepare a written review but has access to the reviews written by others. Panelists may meet face to face or remotely.

Q3. Since October 2015, I have served as ____ for NSF:

- ❍ An ad hoc reviewer only
- ❍ A panelist/panel reviewer only
- ❍ Both an ad hoc reviewer and a panelist/panel reviewer

Q4. Approximately how many reviews of individual proposals have you written for NSF since October 1, 2015, regardless of whether as an ad hoc reviewer or a panelist? (Your best estimate is fine; no decimals, please.) *[text box]*

Q5. Approximately how many reviews of individual proposals or applications have you written for other funding agencies since October 1, 2015? (Your best estimate is fine; no decimals, please.) *[text box]*

Q6. * During the past **12 months**, have you declined to…

(Note: If you have not been asked to perform one or more of these functions, please answer "no".)

	Yes	No
Q6A.	Serve as an ad hoc reviewer for NSF?	
Q6B.	Serve as a face-to-face panelist on an NSF review panel?	
Q6C.	Serve as a remote panelist on an NSF review panel?	

[Visible if "yes" to any option in Q6]

Q7. Thinking about the most recent time you declined to participate in a review, to what extent did the following factors influence your decision?

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at all

Q7A. Proposal or program was not related to my professional interests
Q7B. Lack of time
Q7C. Conflict of interest
Q7D. Too many NSF review requests
Q7E. Competing professional pressures (including teaching, organizational administration service, etc.)
Q7F. Dissatisfaction with the proposal review process
Q7G. Increasing commitments as a reviewer to other funding agencies
Q7H. ***[Visible only if Q6B is "Yes"]*** Unable to travel to a face-to-face panel
Q7I. ***[Visible only if Q6C is "Yes"]*** Dislike participating in discussions over phone, video-conference, or web-based meeting technology
Q7J. Some other factor (Specify):

Q8. Thinking about the most recent time you wrote a review of an NSF proposal, please estimate the amount of time (rounded to the nearest hour) that it took you to read the proposal, write, and submit that single written review. Please do not count time spent travelling to or sitting in panels.

(Please enter a whole number in the box below). *[text box]*

Q9. When do you typically read proposals and write reviews of NSF proposals?

- ❍ Mainly during your normal work-day
- ❍ Mainly outside of your normal working hours
- ❍ Both during the work-day and outside your normal working hours

Q10. How does your employer view your participation as a reviewer (for NSF or other funding agencies)?

- ❍ My employer considers my participation as a reviewer to fall **within** the scope of my normal work duties.
- ❍ My employer considers my participation as a reviewer to fall **outside** the scope of my normal work duties.
- ❍ I am unsure how my employer views my participation.

OverallPropQual_Intro: The following questions will ask you about your perceptions about the quality of the proposals you have reviewed.

Q11. Based on your experience reviewing proposals for NSF, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Q11A. Overall, the majority of proposals I have reviewed in recent years have been of high quality.
Q11B. Individuals submitting proposals are treated fairly.

RO_Intro: The following questions ask about your experience preparing to review proposals for NSF.

Q12. To what extent do you use the following strategies when completing proposal reviews?

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at All

Q12A. Read the merit review criteria before you read the proposal(s)
Q12B. Take notes when reading the proposal
Q12C. Focus on strengths and weaknesses with respect to the review criteria
Q12D. Include specific and concrete examples
Q12E. Critically read your review
Q12F Actively reflect on your own thought processes
Q12G. Think of alternative views
Q12H. Play a devil's advocate to your own assessment
Q12I. Take time with your decision
Q12J. Use some other strategy (specify): _____

Q13. To what extent are you familiar with the following unconscious cognitive biases that can affect reviews?

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at All

Q13A. **Anchoring bias**: Relying too heavily on one piece of information or an initial impression (the anchor) and neglecting subsequent information.
Q13B. **Confirmation bias**: Unconsciously attending to evidence that confirms our existing beliefs or expectations.
Q13C. **Halo effect**: When an overall positive impression of a person's past achievements influences judgements of the specific merits of a proposal.
Q13D. **Language bias**: Tendency to judge ideas or statements from non-native speakers more critically.
Q13E. **Social stereotype bias**: Unconscious and automatic thoughts and feelings about other people influenced by social categories (e.g., age, ethnicity, race, nationality, gender, occupation).

Q14. * *[REVIEWER ORIENTATION FILTER]* NSF recently began offering reviewer orientation information in a 20-minute video with tips about how to prepare a high-quality review. Have you seen this video?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No ***[skip to Q19]***
- ❍ Unsure ***[skip to Q19]***

Q15. At what stage of the review process did you watch the reviewer orientation video? If you watched it at multiple stages, please select all that apply.

Q15A. Prior to reviewing the proposal(s)
Q15B. After reading the proposal(s) but before writing my review(s)
Q15C. After writing my review(s) but before participating in the panel discussion
Q15D. Not sure/can't remember ***[Exclusive answer]***

Video_Intro: The reviewer orientation video includes three segments:

1. tips for how to prepare an analytical review,
2. a description of the merit review criteria with guidance on the broader impact criterion, and
3. information about strategies to mitigate the effects of unconscious cognitive biases.

Q16. Please indicate the degree to which you found the information in these segments to be helpful:

Very Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Slightly Helpful	Not Helpful	Do Not Recall

Q16A. Tips on how to prepare an analytical review
Q16B. Guidance to reviewers on the broader impact criterion
Q16C. Information about strategies to mitigate the effects of unconscious cognitive biases

Q17. Please indicate the degree to which you found the reviewer orientation video helpful when you prepared your reviews:

Very Helpful	Moderately Helpful	Slightly Helpful	Not Helpful	Do Not Recall

Q18. Do you now recall any of the tips provided in the reviewer orientation video?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Q19. To what extent has participating as an NSF reviewer…

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at All

Q19A. Improved your understanding of the proposal process?
Q19B. Provided useful information for improving your next proposal?
Q19C. Influenced you to submit to another funding agency?
Q19D. Discouraged you from submitting your proposals to NSF?

[Visible only if answered "Yes" to question 1B; if "No" is selected for 1B, skip to Q29]

C. Experiences as an Investigator

PI_Intro: NSF is interested in your experience seeking funding from NSF and other sources. Please answer the following questions based on your experience as a principal investigator (PI), not on any experience that you may have had as a co-investigator. Please think only of the proposals you have submitted to NSF since October 1, 2015.

Q20. * Since October 1, 2015, how many proposals have you submitted to NSF? (Note: Please enter a whole number in the box below.) *[textbox]*

Q21. * Since October 1, 2015, have you applied for funding from a federal agency other than the National Science Foundation?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No → ***Skip to Q23***

[Visible if Q21= "Yes"] Q22. Compared to other federal agencies' proposal submission systems, how much effort, on the part of a researcher preparing a proposal, does it take to write and complete a proposal in the required format and submit it to NSF?

- ❍ More Effort
- ❍ Nearly the Same Effort
- ❍ Less Effort

Q23. Thinking about the most recent proposal you submitted to NSF, how much time did you spend preparing (writing, formatting and submitting) the proposal?

- ❍ Less than 40 hours
- ❍ 41 - 80 hours
- ❍ 81 - 120 hours
- ❍ 121 - 160 hours
- ❍ 161 - 200 hours
- ❍ More than 200 hours

Q24. * Since October 1, 2015, have you received a funding decision for any proposals you submitted to NSF?

- ❍ Yes, I have received a decision for at least 1 proposal submitted to NSF since October 1, 2015.
- ❍ No.

Q25. * Have you ever submitted a proposal to NSF that was declined?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No → ***Skip to PI_Sat _Intro***

[Visible only if Q25 = "Yes"] Q26. To what extent did the written reviews that accompanied the declination of one of your NSF proposals…

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at All

Q26A. Improve your understanding of the proposal process?
Q26B. Provide useful information for revising and improving your next proposal?
Q26C. Influence you to submit to another funding agency?
Q26D. Discourage you from revising and submitting your proposals to NSF?

[Visible if Q24 = "Yes"] PI_Sat_Intro: For the following questions, please refer to the most recent proposal that you submitted to NSF for which you have received an award or decline decision.

Q27. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with...

Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neither Dissatisfied nor Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable

Q27A. The quality of the information NSF provided during the proposal submission process (i.e., FastLane, FAQs, web site content)
Q27B. The timeliness of the decision to award or decline funding
Q27C. Your interaction with NSF staff
Q27D. The overall quality of NSF's merit review process

Q28. Based on your experience submitting proposals to NSF, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable

Q28A. Written reviews are thorough
Q28B. Written reviews are technically sound
Q28C. Overall, written reviews are of high quality
Q28D. The panel summary or summaries are of high quality
Q28E. The information provided regarding the outcomes of the competition is of high quality
Q28F. The PO Comments I viewed in FastLane helped me understand the decision to decline or award my proposal
Q28G. The conversations (email, phone, face-to-face) I had with my program officer provided me with helpful feedback about my proposal
Q28H. Individuals submitting proposals are treated fairly

D. All Respondents

Q29. Think about your collective experiences with the NSF merit review process. Based on your experience, to what extent do the following factors influence the ratings given by reviewers?

To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Small Extent	Not at All	Don't Know

Q29A. PI career stage
[Show if Q29A = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29B. PI geographic location
[Show if Q29B = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29C. PI gender
[Show if Q29C = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29D. PI institution
[Show if Q29D = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29E. PI race/ethnicity
[Show if Q29E = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29F. PI reputation/experience
[Show if Q29F = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29G. Level of risk of proposed research
[Show if Q29G = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29H. Reviewer interest in proposed research topic
[Show if Q29H = To a Great Extent] Please describe
_____

Q29I. Other (Please describe) _____

Q30. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements:

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Q30A. Overall, I am satisfied with NSF's merit review process

Q30B. Overall, I think NSF's merit review process is fair
Q30C. Overall, I think NSF's merit review process is effective
Q30D. ***[Show if answered "Yes" to question 1A-Reviewers]*** Overall, I intend to continue to review proposals for NSF in the future
Q30E. ***[Show if answered "Yes" to question 1B-Investigators]*** Overall, I intend to continue to submit proposals to NSF in the future

Q31. This survey has asked about your experiences with NSF's merit review process. In your opinion, improving which **one** of the following factors will have the most significant effect on improving the merit review process? Please select one.

- ❍ Timeliness of decisions about, and responsiveness to, proposals by NSF staff
- ❍ Quality of feedback to PIs in the form of comments in written reviews
- ❍ Quality of feedback to PIs in the form of comments in panel summaries
- ❍ Quality of PI conversations with, and written comments from, program officers
- ❍ Quality of information available during proposal submission
- ❍ Quality of the review process from the perspective of a reviewer

Q32. Please enter any additional comments you may have about NSF's merit review process in the space below: ____ *[Essay text box]*

Demo_Intro: The following questions will prompt you to provide basic information on your early career experience with NSF, and your institution/organization as well as some demographic information. If you work for multiple organizations, please pick the one you consider to be your primary employer and answer in terms of that organization. (Data will be reported at an aggregated level and are requested to help us understand the experiences of different groups.)

Q33. In what year did you receive your highest degree? (Please do not count honorary degrees.) Please select a year from the drop-down menu. *[drop down menu including years 1950 through 2017 + 'before 1950']*

Q34. Did you receive any financial support (e.g. research assistantship, fellowship, traineeship, scholarship, other grants) from NSF as an undergraduate or graduate student?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No → ***Skip to Q37***
- ❍ Don't know → ***Skip to Q37***

Q35. ***[Visible If Q34= "Yes"]*** What type of financial support did you receive from NSF while you were an undergraduate or graduate student?

	Yes	No
Q35A. REU (research experience for undergraduates) support		
Q35B. Research assistantship		
Q35C. Fellowship support		
Q35D. Traineeship support		

Q35E. Scholarship
Q35F. Travel grant
Q35G. Other – please specify *[… Text box with character limit …]*

Q36. ***[Visible If Q34 = "Yes"]*** If appropriate, please provide the name(s) of the NSF program(s) you received support from as an undergraduate or graduate student. *[… Text box with character limit …]*

Q37. Are you a "soft-money" researcher (your appointment requires that 75% or more of the annual salary for the research position you hold is funded by grant monies, rather than your employer)?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No
- ❍ Not sure

Q38. * Do you work for an institution of higher education?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No ***→ Skip to Q44***

Q39. Please select the basic classification that best describes your institution.

- ❍ **Doctoral university**. Includes institutions that award at least 20 research/scholarship doctoral degrees/year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.
- ❍ **Master's College or University.** Generally includes institutions that award at least 50 master's degrees and fewer than 20 doctoral degrees/year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.
- ❍ **Baccalaureate College.** Includes institutions where baccalaureate or higher degrees represent at least 50 percent of all degrees but where fewer than 50 master's degrees or 20 doctoral degrees are awarded/year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.
- ❍ **Baccalaureate/Associate's College.** Includes four-year colleges that confer more than 50 percent of degrees at the associate's level/year. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges, and institutions that have sufficient master's or doctoral degrees to fall into those categories.
- ❍ **Associate's College.** Institutions at which the highest level degree awarded is an associate's degree. Excludes Special Focus Institutions and Tribal Colleges.
- ❍ **Special Focus Institution.** Institutions where a high concentration of degrees is in a single field or set of related fields. Excludes Tribal Colleges.
- ❍ **Tribal College.** Colleges and universities that are members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium. ***→ Skip to Q41***

Q40. Is it a minority-serving institution (i.e., a Tribal College or University, an Historically Black College or University, or an Hispanic-Serving Institution)? (These are Department of Education Title IV designations for institutions of higher education that enroll populations with significant percentages of undergraduate minority students.)

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Q41. Do you have tenure?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Q42. Does your contract of employment provide fewer than 9 months of salary?

- ❍ Yes
- ❍ No

Q43. What is your position?

- ❍ Post-doctoral fellow
- ❍ Assistant Professor
- ❍ Associate Professor
- ❍ Full Professor
- ❍ Adjunct Professor
- ❍ Emeritus/Emerita Professor
- ❍ Retired
- ❍ Other (please specify): *[… Text box with character limit …]*

<If answered "Yes" to Q38, skip to Demographics_Info at this point>

Q44. * Which of the following best describes your organization?

- ❍ An institution of primary and/or secondary education
- ❍ Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC) → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Other non-profit research organization → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ For-profit research organization → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Industrial or commercial company → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Federal government → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ State government → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Local government → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Professional society → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***
- ❍ Other, please specify*: […Text box with character limit …]* → ***Skip to Demographics_Info***

Q45. Which of the following best describes your position?

- ❍ Teacher or Instructor
- ❍ Curriculum design specialist
- ❍ Administrator
- ❍ Other

Demographics_Info: The next three questions request demographic information in standard categories that are defined government-wide. You may have wondered why you see such requests when interacting with NSF. We use the demographic information to generate statistics that help us gauge whether our programs and other opportunities in science and technology reach and benefit everyone regardless of demographic category. The most helpful way to complete these questions is to pick the category or categories that you feel best describe yourself. You are also provided the option to not specify a category for each question.

Q46. Gender:

- ❍ Female
- ❍ Male
- ❍ Prefer not to specify

Q47. Ethnicity:

- ❍ Hispanic or Latino
- ❍ Not Hispanic or Latino
- ❍ Prefer not to specify

Q48. Race (select one or more):

Q48A. American Indian or Alaska Native
Q48B. Asian
Q48C. Black or African American
Q48D. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
Q48E. White
Q48F. Prefer not to specify ***[exclusive answer]***

Appendix B: Survey Recruitment and Reminder Materials

Initial Prenotification Email (from NSF):

Dear [NAME]:

I am writing to request your participation in a survey funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). The purpose of this survey, entitled "Satisfaction of Applicants (Principal Investigators) and Reviewers with NSF's Merit Review Process," is to provide updated data with respect to participants' satisfaction with various aspects of NSF's merit review process, including reviewer workload and other factors influencing review quality.

Your participation in the survey will help NSF ensure that the merit review process continues to serve the needs of the Nation, the Foundation, and the proposal-writing and reviewer communities. Your responses will help NSF to maintain the quality of the review process while minimizing the burden on proposers and reviewers and exploring potential technological enhancements.

Our contractor, Insight Policy Research (Insight), an independent research organization, has been tasked with surveying all proposers and reviewers that participated in the merit review process in fiscal year 2016 to the present. In the next few days, you will receive an email from Insight inviting you to participate in this survey. The survey should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete and will be open until Month Day, 2019.

I would like to thank you in advance for your important contribution to this research. Be assured that survey responses will only be shared in the aggregate, and specific findings will not be attributed to particular individuals. Your thoughts and feedback on the merit review process are very important and will help the NSF continue to improve both the process and the experiences of proposers and reviewers.

If you have questions regarding the survey, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Iacono
Office Head
Office of Integrative Activities
National Science Foundation

OMB Control Number: 3145-0215

Expiration Date: [insert date]

Initial Invitation Email (from Insight):

Dear NSF Reviewer or Principal Investigator:

This email is a follow-up to an email you received from Suzanne Iacono, Office Head of NSF's Office of Integrative Activities. Insight Policy Research (Insight) is conducting a survey on behalf of NSF to collect data about applicants (principal investigators) and reviewers' experiences with the merit review process.

Please respond to this survey by Month, Date 2019.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes of your time and will ask you about your experiences as a proposer and/or reviewer for NSF. These data will be used by NSF to improve the merit review process.

As a reminder, survey results will only be shared in the aggregate, and specific findings will not be attributed to particular individuals. In order to enhance the security of the information you provide, you will be required to enter a password to access the survey. If you exit the survey for any reason, you may click on the survey URL and enter your password again to resume your progress.

To complete the survey, please click on the unique link provided below.

Unique survey link: [URL]

We at Insight and NSF know how busy you are, and we appreciate you sharing your time to assist NSF in this way. If you have any questions about the survey or its administration, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Sincerely,

Meg Trucano, Ph.D.
Data Collection Lead

First Reminder Email (from Insight):

Dear [NAME]:

This email is a follow-up to remind you that Insight Policy Research (Insight) is conducting a survey on behalf of NSF to collect data about applicants (principal investigators) and reviewers' experiences with the merit review process.

Please respond to this survey by Month, Date, 2019.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes of your time and will ask you about your experiences as a proposer and/or reviewer for NSF. These data will be used to improve the merit review process.

As a reminder, survey results will only be shared in the aggregate, and specific findings will not be attributed to particular individuals. In order to enhance the security of the information you provide, you will be required to enter a password to access the survey. If you exit the survey for any reason, you may click on the survey URL and enter your password again to resume your progress.

To complete the survey, please click on the unique link provided below.

Unique survey link: [URL]

We at Insight and NSF know how busy your schedules are, and we appreciate you sharing your time to assist NSF in this way. If you have any questions about the survey or its administration, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Sincerely,

Meg Trucano, Ph.D.
Data Collection Lead
Insight Policy Research

Second Reminder Email (from NSF):

Dear Colleague,

I am writing again to request your participation in an important survey about the NSF merit review process.

As someone who participated in the merit review process between fiscal years 2016 and 2018, you should have received an email from Insight Policy Research (Insight), including a link to the survey. If you have already completed the survey, I thank you for your time and effort. If you have not yet completed the survey, I highly encourage you to do so as soon as possible. Your feedback will help the NSF continue to improve both the process and the experiences of applicants (principal investigators) and reviewers.

If you have any questions regarding the survey, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Iacono
Office Head
Office of Integrative Activities
National Science Foundation

OMB Control Number: 3145-0215

Expiration Date: [insert date]

Final Reminder Email (from Insight):

Dear [NAME]:

This email is to a final reminder that Insight Policy Research (Insight) is conducting a survey on behalf of NSF to collect data about proposers' and reviewers' experiences with the merit review process.

We hope that you can respond to this important survey by Month, Date, 2019.

This survey will take approximately 20 minutes of your time and will ask you about your experiences as a proposer and/or reviewer for NSF. These data will be used to improve the merit review process.

As a reminder, survey results will only be shared in the aggregate, and specific findings will not be attributed to particular individuals. In order to enhance the security of the information you provide, you will be required to enter a password to access the survey. If you exit the survey for any reason, you may click on the survey URL and enter your password again to resume your progress.

To complete the survey, please click on the unique link provided below.

Unique survey link: [URL]

We at Insight and NSF know how busy your schedules are, and we appreciate you sharing your time to assist NSF in this way. If you have any questions about the survey or its administration, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Sincerely,

Meg Trucano, Ph.D.
Data Collection Lead
Insight Policy Research

Insight Thank You Email:

Dear [NAME]:

We would like to thank you for your time in completing NSF's survey about your experiences with the merit review process. Your responses are very important to NSF.

If you have any questions about the survey or its administration, please contact the Insight Helpdesk at surveyhelp@insightpolicysurvey.com.

Thank you,

Meg Trucano, Ph.D.
Data Collection Lead
Insight Policy Research