

*A Federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with an information collection subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 unless the information collection has a currently valid OMB Control Number. The approved OMB Control Number for this information collection is 0690-0030. Without this approval, we could not conduct this survey. Public reporting for this information collection is estimated to be approximately 12 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the information collection. All responses to this information collection are voluntary. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this information collection, including suggestions for reducing this burden to the NOAA Climate Program Office, Daniel.Barrie@noaa.gov.*

## MAPP PI survey

The purpose of the survey is to (1) gain insights into researcher perspectives on the efficiency of the MAPP grant application processes and its merits, limitations, and challenges; (2) explore researcher responses to some ideas of improving MAPP award processes and distribution.

\* Required

What stage are you in your career? (Years since received PhD degree) \*

Choose ▼

With what type of entity are you affiliated? \*

- NOAA Federal Employee
- NOAA Affiliate Employee
- Other Federal Institution
- Academic
- International
- Other:

Within which OPM-designated metropolitan locality is your institution located? \*

Sorted alphabetically by region first, then state

 [Request edit access](#)



Choose

How much of your total current research funding is from your MAPP award(s)? \*

Choose

 This is a required question

How many awards have you received from MAPP in your career? \*

Choose

How many and what type of full- and part-time researchers are involved in your typical MAPP-funded project? \*

	0	1/4	1/2	3/4	1	2	3
undergraduate students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
graduate students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
post-doc researchers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
professors or research associates	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
other staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

 Request edit access



Next

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This form was created inside of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. [Report Abuse](#)

Google Forms

 Request edit access



# MAPP PI survey

\* Required

Application Experience



What motivated you to apply to a CPO/MAPP solicitation? \*

Please rank from least important = 1 to most important = 5

	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Generally secure more research funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interest in MAPP research topic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Desire to work on NOAA-relevant issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pursue research relevant to expertise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Support post-doc or student	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

How many working hours did it take to prepare and submit your most recent proposal to MAPP including all aspects of the proposal writing and submission process? \*

Your answer



For a typical MAPP-sized award of \$510K over a three-year period, the time it takes you to develop and submit a proposal is\_\_ given the size/duration of the award: \*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
too short	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	too long



To what extent do you feel the following categorical factors influence CPO/MAPP's peer review process, impacting your proposal's evaluation? \*

	1 (Weakly Influence)	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
researcher career stage	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
researcher gender	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
researcher race	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
institution type	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
institution location	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
amount of funding requested	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
quality of proposed science	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
qualifications of applicants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
relevance to agency	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
relevance to program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
relevance to solicitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about the review process \*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The review panel feedback I received was constructive and informative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I incorporated the panel review comments into my research over the course of the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I used the panel review summary to improve my future proposal submissions to CPO/MAPP	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have a clear understanding of the grant review process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grant peer review is the best method to allocate research funding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grant peer review treats junior researchers objectively	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Grant peer review encourages innovative or risky research	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>





Other methods, besides grant peer review, are needed to allocate research funding

A double blind peer review processes (where identity of the PIs is kept anonymous to the reviewers) would reduce inherent bias toward your proposal in the CPO/MAPP review process

MAPP should use a double-blind review process

MAPP should include mail/external reviewers in addition to the panel review

Local economic factors (e.g. market salaries, cost of living, institutional costs) have a significant impact on the cost-competitiveness my proposal

Proposal budget limits should be proportional to the local cost of



living, as  
opposed to a  
single fixed  
ceiling  
everywhere

The Research  
Performance  
Progress Report  
allows me to  
effectively  
communicate  
project progress



What percentage of your submitted MAPP proposals would you estimate are ultimately funded? \*

- 0-20%
- 20-40%
- 40-60%
- 60-80%
- 80-100%

Thinking about your most recent proposal submitted to MAPP, what would be the optimal budget limit for your proposed work to reach the scientific objectives related to the competition? \*

Keep in mind that larger individual grants would cause lower proposal success rates since program funds are limited.

Choose



Do you have any comments on the current process to submit proposals, things we might consider to make the process simpler and less arduous, suggestions on factors to consider when considering proposal budget caps, or any other comments regarding your application experience?

Your answer

[Back](#)

[Next](#)

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This form was created inside of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. [Report Abuse](#)

Google Forms



# MAPP PI survey

\* Required

## Alternative funding models

This section explores alternative options to disburse funding efficiently and effectively.

In some theoretical cases, successful proposals could receive seed as opposed to full funding depending on results from the panel review. Seed funding may provide start-up funds to early career researchers learning how to submit successful proposals, target meritorious tasks in otherwise non-meritorious projects enhancing project success, and provide at least some compensation for the submission of a proposal instead of a limited all-or-nothing proposition as exists currently. Implementing a seed funding option would necessitate a reduction in the success rate of fully-funded proposals since program funds are limited.

Currently, MAPP receives 30-40 proposals per competition and funds proposals at or near their requested amount (depending on panel comments and typically maximum \$170K per year) at a 1/4-1/3 success rate.

What would be an optimal minimum amount of seed funding to usefully support a discrete task from a proposal (use your best estimation of a typical proposal task)? \*

Choose



Which of the following funding models would be most beneficial to the broad research community? \*

This hypothetical assumes a typical competition with 40 submitted proposals at \$170k/year each, and 13 successful proposals. Seed funding options use \$70k/year value. Note that the hybrid full/seed funding models would never fund proposals or tasks deemed deficient in the panel review.

Proposal Rank	13 full, 0 seed	12 full, 2 seed	11 full, 5 seed	10 full, 7 seed	9 full, 10 seed	
1	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	<b>Key:</b> <span style="background-color: #c8e6c9; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">fully funded</span> <span style="background-color: #fff9c4; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">partially (seed) funded</span> <span style="background-color: #ffcdd2; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">not funded</span>
2	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
3	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
4	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
5	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
6	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
7	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
8	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
9	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	
10	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	partially (seed) funded	
11	fully funded	fully funded	fully funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
12	fully funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
13	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
14	not funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
15	not funded	not funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
16	not funded	not funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
17	not funded	not funded	not funded	partially (seed) funded	partially (seed) funded	
18	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	partially (seed) funded	
19	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	partially (seed) funded	
20	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
21	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
22	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
23	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
24	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
25	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
26	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
27	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
28	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
29	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
30	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
31	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
32	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
33	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
34	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
35	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
36	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
37	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
38	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
39	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	
40	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	not funded	



Choose



Please indicate your position for the following statements on the new seeds funding model. \*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The seed fund approach would reduce my overall time spent submitting proposals by distributing funds more broadly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seed funds would help my research and career development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The availability of seed awards with an overall higher success funding rate would motivate me to submit more proposals to MAPP	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would be comfortable with the review panel identifying components of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



my proposal to receive with seed funding

Elements of my proposals can typically be discretely

divided into components for partial funding

If you received seed instead of full funding, what would you use the funding for?

\*

Please rank from least likely = 1 to most likely = 5

	1 (least likely application)	2	3	4	5 (most likely application)
PI salary	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
postdoc	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
graduate student	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
travel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
publications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Do you have any thoughts or concerns about this hypothetical seed funding system which are not covered by the questions above? \*

Your answer



Back

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

This form was created inside of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. [Report Abuse](#)

Google Forms

