

Panel Orientation Cycle 14



March 14, 2005

Cycle 14 Overview

⇒ 727 proposals requesting:

↔ 14,173 orbits

▽ Plus: 1100 [Cyc15] & 24 [Cyc16]

↔ 5149 SNAP targets

↔ \$15.2 M AR funding (including Theory)

Review Process

- ⇒ TAC selects Treasury/Large programs
- ⇒ Panels select the rest of the proposals
- ⇒ Panels review broad areas of science
- ⇒ “Mirror” panels minimize conflicts and maximize attendance and participation by all panelists

Continued features since Cycle 11

- ⇒ TAC meets after panels-
- ⇒ Panels will provide input on Large/Treasury programs via Chairs
- ⇒ “Progressive subsidy” for Regular proposals
- ⇒ Chandra allocation for multi-wavelength programs
- ⇒ NOAO allocation for supporting ground-based observations

Cycle 14

- ⇒ Will continue
 - ↔ Large and Treasury programs
 - ↔ Theory
 - ↔ Archival Legacy
- ⇒ New are Joint HST/Spitzer programs

Types and Sizes of Proposals

⇒ GO - orbits

↔ Large (100 or more orbits)

▽ 900 orbits allocated

↔ Regular (1-99 orbits)

▽ 1700 to Panels+ 300 to subsidy

⇒ SNAP - targets

↔ one visit = one target

↔ no links, no guarantees

↔ 2000 to be selected

↔ probability of execution ~50%

Proposal categories

⇒ Treasury

- ↔ Provide datasets for lasting value to HST program
- ↔ Should focus on potential to solve multiple problems
- ↔ Provide enhanced data products

⇒ AR Legacy -funding required

- ↔ Provide homogeneous set of calibrated data
- ↔ Should enable new and important science

⇒ (AR) Theory- funding required

- ↔ Direct relevance to HST observational research
- ↔ Mission-specific favored over general theory programs

Other Categories

⇒ Long-term Programs

↔ Cycle 14 TAC/Panels can award Cycle 15/16 time (limited), where *required* by science.

↔ (No proposal resubmission in those cycles)

⇒ Target-of-Opportunity (TOO) Proposals

↔ ~3 ultra-fast (< 2 days) activations (15 orbit overhead for each activation)

↔ 2-11 days: 15 – 30 activations allowed

Other Categories

- ⇒ Calibrations: enhance science from HST
 - ↔ Time comes from a different pool. Nevertheless is still observing time.
- ⇒ Joint HST-Chandra, HST-NOAO, HST-Spitzer Proposals
- ⇒ Multi-wavelength proposals may request
 - ▽ Chandra time
 - Up to 400 ks available, 80 ks time-constrained
 - ▽ KPNO/CTIO time
 - Up to 15-20 nights available on most telescopes
 - ▽ Spitzer time
 - Up to 225 hours available

Other Categories

⇒ Parallel Observations

- ↔ **Coordinated parallel** ⇒ occurs during proposed primary. Must be proposed for and awarded explicitly (in database) in order to be implemented.
- ↔ **Pure parallel** ⇒ independent of primary observation.
- ↔ 350 orbits available for GO pure parallel programs in Cycle 14

Other Categories (cont'd)

⇒ Continuous Viewing Zone (CVZ)

- ↔ Proposal should request CVZ orbits when it will benefit the science and efficiency
- ↔ CVZ use, even if possible may not be a good idea for some programs since the sky can be bright during the day side of the orbit.
- ↔ STScI will try to schedule observation with CVZ orbits;
- ↔ No penalty to observer if executed as non-CVZ.

2-gyro vs 3-gyro

⇒ Proposers were asked

↔ To describe their science in the regular 3-Gyro mode and make the scientific case based on the regular performance

↔ To explain whether their science can still be done in 2GM; if so,

▽ describe potential modifications to the proposal e.g. number of additional orbits required to achieve the same S/N; reduced no. of targets or lower S/N.

▽ describe how/whether the key science will be affected

↔ Only 6 proposals indicate that the science program is not possible in 2GM

Assessment

- ⇒ TAC & Panels will rank proposals based on the proposed science (as usual), and assuming 3-Gyro operations.
- ⇒ In addition they will produce an alternative rank list of the **top proposals** under the assumption that they will be executed in the 2G mode.
- ⇒ Finally, we will ask the TAC & Panels to give their assessment of the likely science impact of 2-Gyro observations. This should reflect two perspectives:
 - ↔ A global assessment of science lost due to PSF degradation, longer acquisition times, etc.
 - ↔ Specific identification of key science that cannot be done in 2-Gyro mode.

TAC Feedback

- ⇒ Each panel will compile a brief assessment of the likely science impact of moving to 2-gyro operations.
- ⇒ Those assessments will be summarized by the TAC, who will provide the Director with an accompanying recommendation on an intentional switch to 2-gyro mode operations.
- ⇒ That advice will be one of several factors that will be considered by STScI in making a recommendation to the Project on when/whether to switch to 2-gyro mode observations.

Policy Issues

- ⇒ Broad impact of Treasury science
- ⇒ Self containment of science
 - ↔ Are all the needed resources included in the proposal?
- ⇒ Public availability of data
 - ↔ Is the plan clear?
 - ↔ Are the resources adequate?
 - ↔ Are the milestones acceptable?
- ⇒ Timeliness of opportunity
 - ↔ ToO: e.g. η Car outburst
 - ↔ Coeval datasets
 - ↔ e.g. GOODS & SN

Policy Guidelines for Cycle 14

★ Duplications

- ↔ NASA policy protects GTO programs against duplication by GO; duplicate targets will be disallowed or embargoed (applies to ACS GTO plans).
- ↔ Duplications are defined as *same target or field, same or similar instrument, similar mode, similar spectral range*. **Consult SPD staff if in doubt.**
- ↔ PI responsible for noting duplications. Panels should approve duplications explicitly (in comments) or observations can be disallowed.
- ↔ Same-Cycle duplications: avoid duplicate targets within and between panels. No “forced collaborations” allowed.
- ↔ Cross-panel duplications resolved by Chairs of “mirror” panels
 - ▽ (Breakfast meeting, 2nd/3rd days).

Selected Policy Guidelines

- ⇒ Cutting orbits is discouraged.
- ⇒ No rejection on technical grounds unless explicitly approved by STScI technical experts.
 - ↔ Technical reviews were done only for Large, Treasury, Calibration, Pure Parallel, ToO proposals.
 - ↔ Regular proposals reviewed after Phase I. If technical questions arise during review, summon relevant expert.
 - ↔ Technical reviews done by instrument scientists and planning & scheduling experts (not PSS/PSD).
 - ↔ **EXPERTS AVAILABLE VIA PHONE**
- ⇒ Note NICMOS vs. Ground Based AO paper
- ⇒ Special calibrations require additional orbits.

Policy Guidelines

- ★ Conflicts of interest - definition
 - ↔ Personal involvement (PI or Co-I)
 - ↔ Same department or same institution as PI or Co-I
 - ▽ Relaxed since Cycle 12 based on TAC Review Panel recommendation
 - ↔ Close collaborator or [recent] former advisor/student of PI or Co-I
 - ↔ Involvement in closely competing proposal (same targets/science)
 - ↔ Any other reason for discomfort (e.g., family ties)

Policy Guidelines

- ★ Conflicts of interest - procedures
 - ↔ Panelists sign Conflicts of Interest Disclosure form and return to PSS/PSD.
 - ↔ Note conflicts before discussion of each proposal.
 - ↔ Conflicted panelist(s) leave room for discussion and vote.
 - ↔ **If in doubt, ask SPD for clarification.**

(Panel redundancy eliminates many conflicts)

Panel Review Meeting Overview

- ⇒ Panel Chair runs meeting
 - ↔ Panel selects Co-Chair to run meeting if Chair has to leave for conflict and to assist with review of comments on day 3
- ⇒ PSD/PSS maintain database, produce ranked lists, answer questions or summon STScI staff experts, as needed. They help facilitate the meeting.
- ⇒ Technical and Policy support is available from STScI staff:
 - ↔ SPD (policy) [We are here and roaming!]
 - ↔ INS (instrument expertise)
 - ↔ OPB (scheduling and implementation)
- ⇒ Contact list by phone in each meeting room

Detailed Panel Procedures

1. Panelists with conflicts of interest leave the room. STScl staff leave if PI or Co-I.
2. Primary reviewer summarizes and reviews proposal. Secondary reviewer add significant comments.
3. Discussion among panelists.
4. Specify resource allocation: primary orbits, coordinated or pure parallel, proprietary period, targets (SNAP) and/or \$ (AR).
5. Vote on proposal (secret ballot).

Those with **ONLY** institutional conflicts may participate in discussion [Chairman decides] but do not vote.

EVERYONE ELSE MUST VOTE

6. Primary Reviewer records additional comments and enters comments via web-based I/F.

Proposed schedule

- ⇒ Panels have 50-80 proposals to discuss
- ⇒ Discuss proposals for $\sim 15 \text{ min} \times 80 = 1200 \text{ min}$
= 20 hours !!!!
 - ↔ **Must triage *and* limit discussion** to 15 min on average
 $15 \text{ min} \times 60 = 900 \text{ min} = 15 \text{ hours}$
- ⇒ Finalize Ranking and define cut off ~ 2 hours
- ⇒ Write final report and review comments ~ 3 hours
- ⇒ Total ~ 20 hours

Proposal Triage — rationale

- ⇒ Optimization
 - ↔ spend more time discussing the best proposals
- ⇒ Time constraint
 - ↔ not enough time to discuss all proposals in detail
- ⇒ Efficiency
 - ↔ no need to discuss proposals that are very unlikely to be approved
- ⇒ Fair
 - ↔ Statistics from previous cycles

Triage — implementation

- ⇒ Panels given triage list (bottom 1/3)
- ⇒ Flagged where few grades, high grades, etc.
- ⇒ Option to “resurrect” a few proposals (watch for conflicts)
- ⇒ Discuss triage process at beginning of panel meeting
 - ↔ [but discuss these proposals at the end!]

Orbit subsidies for medium proposals

- ⇒ Goal: acceptance rate independent of proposal size.
- ⇒ Cost - sharing between general observing pool and Panels.

Proposal Comments required for every proposal

- ⇒ Primary reviewer should add any comment arising from the discussion to produce a final set of comments for each proposal.
- ⇒ Use *Mandatory* comments only to exclude targets [e.g. duplications] or to reduce observing time allocation.
- ⇒ All other comments are *advisory*.

Web I/F for Comments

- ⇒ Have implemented a Web I/F for you to input the comments
 - ↔ *Goes directly into a database for easier dissemination*
- ⇒ <http://tac-comments.stsci.edu/fmi/iwp>
- ⇒ Enter your userid/password found in your folders
 - ↔ Panel Chairs select panel vs TAC database

Comments

TAC 14 - GALAC3

http://tac-comments.stsci.edu:16080/fmi/iwp/cgi?-db=TAC%2014

Address Book Cycle 14 An...ement Page Merit Badge.Com SPD Web Site FOXNews.com Google

TAC 14 - GALAC3

SPACE TELESCOPE SCIENCE INSTITUTE
Operated for NASA by AURA

TAC Review Comments

ID	Category	Type
0021.baldwin	ISM	GO

Title
The PDR in Giant HII Regions

Principal Investigator
Jack Baldwin
Michigan State University

Principal Reviewer

Assigned Panel GALAC3

Strengths

Weaknesses

Record: 1

Found Set: 53

Total Records: 53

Unsorted

Log Out

Responsibilities of Panels

- ⇒ Produce separate ranked lists of GO, SNAP, and AR proposals. Use the same grading scale.
 - ↔ Rank twice as many proposals as are above cut-off line
 - ↔ No need to rank carefully those proposals that clearly will not get accepted.
- ⇒ Panel Chair [and Co-Chair] write a 3-4 page summary, documenting the primary decisions of the panel, the reasoning that went into those decisions and the manner in which contentious issues were resolved
- ⇒ It should capture the logic and rationale of the panels' conclusions in sufficient detail so that it can be recalled and understood later by the STScI Director and/or the TAC

Confidentiality

- ⇒ Remember that you should not discuss the outcome of the Panel evaluations, now or in the future.
- ⇒ Many Panel members are also proposers; don't discuss results during breaks.
- ⇒ If the Panel wants to send a particularly important message to a proposer, use the comments.

Cycle 14 Orbit Allocations

- ⇒ 2900 orbits for GO (Large+Regular)
- ⇒ 900 for Large/Treasury programs
- ↑ ~ 2000 for Regular programs
 - ↔ ~ 300 for orbit subsidy (20-99 orbit proposals)
 - ↔ ~ 1700 for direct allocation
- ⇒ Orbits oversubscription is ~5/1 for Panels and TAC

Other Allocations for Cycle 14

- ⇒ SNAP: ~ 2000 targets across panels (~1/4 targets proposed)
- ⇒ AR: ~\$3 - \$3.5M (~5/1 oversubscription)

TAC

- ▽ Roger Blandford, TAC CHAIR
- ▽ Dave Axon, EXGAL1
- ▽ Martin Ward, EXGAL2
- ▽ Piet van der Kruit, EXGAL3
- ▽ Richard Mushotsky, EXGAL4
- ▽ Colin Norman, EXGAL5
- ▽ Antonella Natta, GAL1
- ▽ Gloria Koenigsberger, GAL2
- ▽ Bob O'Dell, GAL3
- ▽ Bruce Elmegreen, GAL4
- ▽ Monica Tosi, GAL5
- ▽ Fran Bagenal, SS
- ▽ Michael Brown, At-Large
- ▽ Renzo Sancisi, At-Large

Observers

- ▽ **Jennifer Wiseman** - NASA HQ
- ▽ **Jeffrey Hayes** - NASA HQ
- ▽ **Dave Leckrone** - NASA GSFC
- ▽ **Mal Niedner** - NASA GSFC
- ▽ **Ken Carpenter** - NASA GSFC
- ▽ **Jeremy Walsh** - ST/ECF
- ▽ **Nancy Evans** - CXC
- ▽ **Mia Hartman** - NOAO
- ▽ **Nancy Silbermann** - Spitzer

STScI Staff in attendance

⇒ Director's Office

↔ **Steve Beckwith** - Director

⇒ Science Policies Division.

↔ **Duccio Macchetto** - SPD Head

↔ **Bob Williams, Claus Leitherer, Neil Reid , Eva Villaver** - SPD Astronomers

↔ **Brett Blacker** - SPD Technical Manager

↔ **Darlene Spencer** - SPD Administrative Staff

⇒ Hubble Mission

↔ **Rodger Doxsey** - Hubble Mission Head

Questions????

⇒ Please refer ALL policy questions to SPD staff!!!

After the TAC

- ⇒ We plan to review the TAC process
 - ↔ Can we improve it
 - ↔ What were the main shortcomings
 - ↔ Can we make it “faster”, “cheaper”, “better”?
- ⇒ We will send email to all TAC and Panel members requesting your individual views of our process
- ⇒ We also strongly encourage you to discuss this at the end of your Panel meetings and give us a group feed-back

THANK YOU!!!!