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Paper Survey given to panelists for some ROSES panels last fall

- Guest Investigator Program (mag only)
- Supporting Research Program (all sub-disciplines)
- LCAS (HTIDS) Program (ITM-mag only)

Reporting only on SR (Supporting Research)
How many times have you served on a NASA panel?

Number of times served on NASA panel:

- >5
- 3-5
- 2
- 1

Total solar Hsphere mag ITM
Have you **proposed** for Heliophysics funding through NASA ROSES (as PI or CoI)?

Have you been **awarded** Heliophysics funding through NASA ROSES (as PI or CoI)?
Rank the following on a scale of 1 to 5
(where 1 is disagree and 5 is agree)

- panel had sufficient expertise
- panelist self qualified
- proposals discussed in adequate detail
- panelists could express views
- Discussion objective and unbiased
- HQ provided appropriate oversight
- Overall process fair
- Best proposals received highest grades
- similar or better results could be achieved with less effort

HPS Meeting    March 1-2, 2016
Some handwritten comments

• colleagues of PIs showed a tendency to rate higher than average
• more effort should be put into matching the expertise of the panelists with individual proposals
• In general panel was run well. Support was good.
• it would be better to emphasize what PIs need to provide so that their proposals are more successful and also easier for reviewers
• I was not fully familiar with the topic of my assignments (2 of 3 assignments), but I think the proposals were evaluated properly because of help from secondary and other panelists
• panel was well run with excellent logistics and a smooth evaluation process
• overall good experience with a well chosen panel and location.
• Fair review of proposals. Smooth review process. We dedicated an appropriate amount of time for assessing the quality of proposals.
PI survey to go out via SurveyMonkey