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## Mid-Cycle I+II Review Process

- Reviewers were selected from the Cycle 28 External Panelist pool
- The numbers are for Round I and (Round II); the graphics show both rounds combined
- Over 200 (170) reviewers were available
- 95 (90) were utilized for the review with 5 reviewers per proposal; 42 (33) F/53 (56) M


## Process (continued)

- Proposals are graded against Scientific Merit, Importance to Astronomy and Urgency
- $1=$ Excellent to $5=$ Poor Scale
- Final Grade is the average of the individual grades
- Mid-cycle proposals may request up to 15 orbits


## Cycle 28 Mid-Cycle I+II Results

- September 30, 2020 (January 30, 2021) was the deadline for the Mid-Cycle I (II) submissions
- 53 (48) Proposals Reviewed for 363 (251) Orbits
- 22 (13) Proposals recommended for 135 (54) orbits
- Acceptance Rate: 2.5 (3.7) for proposals and 2.7 (4.6) for orbits
- Instrument breakdown: ACS: 13\% (6\%), COS: 2\% (7\%), STIS: 28\% (19\%), and WFC3: 58\% (69\%)
- Imaging: 48\% (74\%) and Spectroscopy: 52\% (26\%)
- ESA acceptance fraction:
- Pls 29\% (46\%) for proposals and 22\% (54\%) for orbits
- ESA Cols are $24 \%$ ( $28 \%$ ) of the total Cols
- UV Initiative: 32\% (15\%) for Proposals and 38\% (19\%) for Orbits


## Mid-Cycle Results by Science Category (Proposals)



## Mid-Cycle Results by Science Category (Orbits)



## Mid-Cycle Acceptance Rate by Science Category



## Gender Distribution

|  | Submitted | Recommended |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 22 | 5 | $23 \%$ |
| Male | 79 | 29 | $37 \%$ |

Submitted: M/F = 78\% / 22\%<br>Recommended: M/F = 85\% / 15\%

## Preparations for the Cycle 29 TAC

## Cycle 29 (Cycle 28) Proposal Statistics

| Total Proposals | 1129(1080) | Cycle 29 | Cycle 30 | Cycle 31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO | $926(865)$ | $22,065(22519)$ | $833(422)$ | $256(218)$ |
| SNAP | $44(41)$ | $5.014(6160)$ | Targets |  |
| Archival Research | Regular | Legacy |  |  |
| Regular | $95(96)$ | $21(27)$ |  |  |
| Theory | $44(54)$ | $1(3)$ |  |  |
| Total | $159(150)$ | $22(24)$ | $181(174)$ |  |
| ESA | $244(213)$ |  |  |  |
| ESA GO | $232(203)$ | $5,958(6170)$ | Orbits |  |
| ESA SNAPs | $10(9)$ | $921(1081)$ | Targets |  |
| ESA AR | $2(1)$ |  |  | 0 |
|  |  |  | ESA |  |
| GO Large | $31(39)$ | $3,581(4033)$ | $12(15)$ | $1,301(1605)$ |
| GO Medium | $117(130)$ | $5,743(6259)$ | $24(31)$ | $1,199(1572)$ |
| GO Treasury | $21(22)$ | $2,457(2886)$ | $8(9)$ | $875(937)$ |
| Pure Parallel | $2(8)$ | $430(2195)$ | $0(0)$ | $0(0)$ |

## Same TAC Process in Cycle 29 as in Cycle 28

- Hybrid approach: dividing proposals between external panels and virtual panels meeting by video-conference.
- External panelists provide the assessment and grading of a subset of Small GO proposals ( $1-15$ orbits) including Snapshot and Archival proposals.
- These proposals are ranked using the grades of the panelists.
- Virtual panels review the remaining Small GO, Medium, Archival Legacy, Large and Treasury proposals. Virtual panelists interact virtually by video-conference.
- These proposals are ranked after the discussion and grading in the virtual panels.
- Exceptions:
- All Solar System proposals will be reviewed by the virtual panel (due to the small proposal pool).
- All Target of Opportunity proposals will be reviewed by their corresponding virtual panels in order to review them in context.
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## TAC Process (continued)

- TAC Chair: Ata Sarajedini (Florida Atlantic University)
- Panel structure in Cycle 29:
- Solar System
- Planets and Planet Formation
- Stellar Physics
- Stellar Populations
- Galaxies
- IGM \& CGM
- Massive Black Holes and Hosts
- Large-scale structure
- Each virtual panel has $8-10$ panelists, a Chair, and a ViceChair (except for Solar System, which has no Vice-Chair)
- The TAC Chair, the Panel Chairs and Vice-Chairs, and the three At-Large Members form the Executive Committee (formerly the super-TAC)


## Available Orbits in Cycle 29

- Roughly 2700 orbits available for Cycle 29 GO proposals (unchanged from Cycle 28)
- Break-down:
- $\mathbf{6 0 0}$ orbits for the TAC (Large and Treasury)
- $\mathbf{1 4 0 0}$ orbits for the Small proposals (Regular GO with 1-34 orbits)
- 700 orbits for medium-sized proposals ( $35-74$ orbits)
- Approximately 1000 SNAP targets


## External Panel Review

- Each panel hosting external panelists has a specific allocation of orbits for Small proposals.
- Snapshot \& Archive allocations are drawn from a central pool.
- External panelists review and grade the assigned proposals.
- STScI produces a ranked list of all programs in each panel based on the received grades.
- Small proposals on the rank-ordered list are recommended for acceptance until the cumulative orbit request exceeds the allocation.
- Archival and Snapshot proposals ranked within the list of recommended Small proposals are recommended for acceptance as well.


## Virtual Panel Review

- Each proposal receives preliminary grades from 6 panelists only (instead of from all) to reduce the workload
- Two panelists will be assigned as reviewers to each proposal when the proposals are distributed. The assignment of Reviewer A vs. B will be made after the result of the triage is known in order to balance the number of A and B reviews for each panelist.
- Preliminary grades are due 10 days prior to the meeting. The triage list will be made available to the panel shortly thereafter so that the panelists can read any proposal they have not graded in more detail.
- During the actual panel meeting all panelists (except for the Chair and Vice-Chair) will vote.
- New: Vice-Chairs (like Chairs) are not assigned any reviews and grades in order to lower their workload.


## Virtual Panel Review (cont.)

- TAC proposals will also be sent to three additional external reviewers who are not TAC members.
- These reviewers are typically previous panelists who are experts in the field.
- The reviewers will comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and the timeliness of the science.
- The reviews will be provided to the TAC reviewers in support of their own assessment.


## Backup:

## C29 Process Details and Submission Statistics

## TAC Process Details

## Proposals reviewed by external panelists:

- Proposals are categorized by science topic and sent to seven panels which host external panelists who are experts on this topic.
- Reviewers grade on an absolute system (excellent $\rightarrow$ poor)
- Grades are collected, averaged and ranked list compiled for that topic
- Orbit allocation by topic based on proposal/orbit pressure
- The highest ranked proposals are marked as recommended for acceptance
- "Recommended" proposals made available to panel chairs prior to the virtual panel meetings
- The panel chairs will use this information to monitor the programmatic balance of the recommended list of proposals reviewed by individual and group panelists.
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## TAC Process (continued)

## Proposals reviewed by virtual group panels:

- There are eight panels, with 9 members, including Chair and Vice-Chair (no Vice-Chair in Solar System). The virtual panelists participate via videoconference.
- Each panel is allocated a specific number of slots for Medium proposals and an orbit allocation for Small proposals based on the proportional proposal/orbit pressure.
- After completing their review, group panels can cross-reference against the proposals recommended by the external panelists to check for duplication/science balance
- Panel chairs/STScI staff have forewarning on potential conflicts
- The panel Chairs and Vice-Chairs, together with the EC Chair and three AtLarge members, constitute the super-TAC that reviews Large/Treasury/Legacy proposals.
- The Executive Committee meets by video-conference as well.


## Proposals by Cycle



Preparations

## Orbits by Cycle



## Proposal Sizes




## Proposals by Science Categories

- Intergalactic Medium and the Circumgalactic Medium, 6.2\%

Galaxies, 24.4\%
SuperMassive Black Holes
and AGN, 9.6\%
■ Large Scale Structure, 5.4\%

## Orbits by Science Categories

- Large Scale Structure, 7.0\%

Intergalactic Medium and the Circumgalactic Medium, 10.3\%

- SuperMassive Black Holes and

Galaxies, 29.2\%


ExoPlanets and Planet Formation, 18.8\%

Solar System, 3.0\%

Stellar Physics, 16.5\%

## C29 Instrument Summary



## GO Requested Instruments



## Cycle 29 Joint Observatory Requests

| Observatory | Proposals | Requested Time | HST Orbits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chandra | 11 | 866 Ksecs | 204 |
| NoirLab | 7 | 15 Nights | 132 |
| NRAO | 9 | 166 Hours | 236 |
| TESS | 4 | 4 Targets | 104 |
| XMM | 12 | 1076 Ksecs | 281 |
| $4 / 27 / 2021$ | C28 Mid-Cycle Results \& C29 <br> Preparations | 28 |  |

## C29: Target of Opportunity Request

|  | Proposals | HST Orbits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Disruptive | 18 | 219 |
| Non-Disruptive | 19 | 505 |
| Both | 12 | 206 |
| Long Term | 28 | 575 |

## C29: Special Initiatives

| Initiative | Proposals | HST Orbits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UV | $394+42$ ARs | 11,084 |
| JWST | 65 | 2,920 |
| Fundamental <br> Physics | $26+8$ ARs | 1,008 |
| Cloud Computing | 5 | - |
| Data Science Software | 0 | - |
| Calibration | 5 | ARs |
| $4 / 27 / 2021$ | C28 Mid-Cycle Results \& C29 |  |
| Preparations |  |  |

## C29: Joint Observatory Requests

| Observatory | Proposals | Requested Time | HST Orbits |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chandra | 11 | 866 Ksecs | 204 |
| NoirLab | 7 | 15 Nights | 132 |
| NRAO | 9 | 166 Hours | 236 |
| TESS | 4 | 4 Targets | 104 |
| XMM | 12 | 1076 Ksecs | 281 |

## Countries of Investigators

| Country | PI | CoPI | Col | Country | PI | CoPI | Col | Country | PI | CoPI | Col |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Afghanistan |  |  | 2 | France | 9 | 8 | 208 | Slovakia |  | 1 | 1 |
| Argentina |  | 1 | 16 | German | 30 | 8 | 366 | Slovenia |  |  | 1 |
| Australia | 11 | 8 | 175 | Greece |  |  | 10 | South Africa |  |  | 12 |
| Austria | 2 | 1 | 18 | Hungary | 3 |  | 8 | Spain | 13 | 4 | 164 |
| Belgium | 1 | 1 | 40 | Iceland |  |  | 4 | Sweden | 16 | 4 | 135 |
| Brazil | 2 | 5 | 33 | India | 6 | 4 | 24 | Switzerland | 19 | 2 | 175 |
| Canada | 23 | 6 | 199 | Ireland |  | 4 | 33 | Taiwan | 3 |  | 31 |
| Chile | 8 | 6 | 120 | Israel | 3 | 1 | 57 | Thailand |  |  | 1 |
| China | 7 | 20 | 88 | Italy | 33 | 9 | 375 | The Netherlands | 20 | 7 | 186 |
| Columbia |  |  | 1 | Japan | 5 | 3 | 121 | The Vatican |  |  | 5 |
| Croatia |  |  | 2 | Korea |  |  | 20 | Turkey |  | 2 | 3 |
| Cyprus |  |  | 2 | Mexico | 3 | 2 | 44 | Ukraine | 2 |  | 6 |
| Czech Republic |  |  | 4 | Norway | 1 |  | 6 | United Arab Emirates |  |  | 5 |
| Denmark | 5 | 1 | 93 | Poland | 2 | 1 | 15 | United Kingdom | 68 | 18 | 582 |
| Finland | 2 |  | 18 | Portugal |  | 2 | 21 | United States | 827 | 224 | 5399 |
|  |  |  |  | Russia | 6 |  | 31 |  |  |  |  |

## US States and Territories of Investigators

| US State | PI | CoPI | Col | US State | PI | CoPI | Col | US State | PI | CoPI | Col |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AK |  |  | 1 | KY | 8 | 5 | 21 | OH | 15 | 4 | 100 |
| AL | 12 | 3 | 42 | LA | 2 |  | 6 | OK | 2 |  | 8 |
| AR |  |  | 1 | MA | 66 | 13 | 384 | OR | 2 |  |  |
| AZ | 66 | 13 | 450 | MD | 147 | 47 | 1173 | PA | 30 | 11 | 119 |
| CA | 149 | 36 | 1039 | ME |  |  | 6 | RI | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| CO | 26 | 5 | 112 | MI | 30 | 8 | 162 | SC | 2 | 1 | 22 |
| CT | 10 | 5 | 56 | MN | 12 | 8 | 71 | TN | 4 |  | 14 |
| DC | 18 | 9 | 172 | MO | 4 | 2 | 24 | TX | 38 | 10 | 273 |
| DE | 3 | 1 | 5 | MT | 3 |  | 5 | UT | 6 |  | 20 |
| FL | 13 | 3 | 62 | NC | 5 | 3 | 26 | VA | 9 | 3 | 106 |
| GA | 5 | 3 | 30 | NE |  |  | 3 | VT | 1 |  | 2 |
| HI | 12 |  | 59 | NH | 1 | 2 | 12 | WA | 11 |  | 58 |
| IA |  | 1 | 6 | NJ | 21 | 3 | 113 | WI | 12 | 4 | 64 |
| IL | 29 | 5 | 232 | NM | 11 | 4 | 56 | WV |  |  | 8 |
| IN | 15 | 5 | 68 | NV | 1 |  | 7 | WY | 3 | 1 | 9 |
| KS | 2 |  | 23 | NY | 20 | 4 | 158 | Virgin Islands |  |  | 4 |

4/27/2021
Preparations

