Discussion topics - AAAC Nov 18, 2014

- Feedback on 2014 Annual Report and Principles Document
- Eclipse Planning (interagency? Just Solar? Communication & Education opportunity)
- Mid-decadal process: AAAC response.
  - Include concerns in March Report?
  - Have an NRC rep at the January meeting?
- Decadal process itself. New models? Format? Compare to P5, other?
- CMB Task Force
- WIYN program and planning
- Demographics
  - Collate ideas presented in meeting.
  - Plan future efforts

PRINCIPLES FOR ACCESS TO LARGE ASTROPHYSICS PROJECTS AND FACILITIES

PRODUCE THE BEST UNDERSTANDING OF OUR UNIVERSE: Strike balance between preserving benefits of resulting data to implementing consortium and funding partners while allowing participation by the wider community

GLOBAL COORDINATION: allows resources to be used efficiently, effectively, and without unnecessary duplication, e.g. jointly developing an astrophysics project as a partnership, or choosing unique astrophysics projects that are complementary.

OPEN DATA: Policies and funding should ensure that large projects make standard data products and analysis tools publicly available in a timely and useable manner.

OPEN ACCESS: Access to a large astrophysics project or facility should be allocated through an open, merit-based process (some level of preferred access for the implementing consortium)

OPPORTUNITY TO CONTRIBUTE: Opportunities to participate based upon openly advertised criteria and processes that are equally applied, regardless of institutional or national affiliation

RECIPROCITY: Nations and funding partners whose communities expect access to external resources should offer access to their own resources.

Demographics

"*demographics*" doesn't properly represent our goals. It is shorthand for
The old funding models are stressed.
With new budget realities How do we operate? What problems are we really focusing on?

- Increased number of proposals ➔ lower success rates
  - Find out who is writing them
    - Clues: are they members of APS, AAS? Transfers or new?
    - Exoplanet and cosmology proposals went up after exciting breakthroughs
    - Is there also increased funding per proposal?
- Impacts reviewer load: either
  - reduce the # of proposals (solutions work for both problems)
  - or find a special solution for reviewer work load reduction
- Impacts balance between individual research grants and projects
  and universities vs national labs

Additional "solutions" suggested

small grant solicitation with high success rate ➔ reviewer load! Multiple proposals
pre-proposals at Universities subject to politics (as are MRI pre-proposals)
pre-proposal stage as part of RFP. Tried by planetary and solar (MORE proposals?)
more top down management. i.e. very strict programmatic requirements
perhaps you could disqualify proposals immediately or redirect them.

We are trying to use observational data to answer a causal question. What would happen if….?

We started with the Solutions – what are the questions we need to ask in order to predict results and behaviors for each? But the working group felt they needed to do step 0 first: what data is available? It was decided that one working group member needs to be assigned to a particular agency, then we compile what we learned. We need to finish this, then move to specific proxy questions that can reveal dangers lurking in the solutions

- No change: Just follow trends to logical conclusion
- One proposal per year per PI
  - This will reduce proposals. So ask about its ramifications: how do you get at science opportunities lost? Interview unsuccessful PI? Who is writing proposals coupled with their career path?
- RFPs every other year
  - Could result in more proposals in the off-year. Survey? Stats on multiple year programs? Career killer, gaps (AAS?)
- Pre-proposal stage (two-step proposals). Others are trying this. More proposals?
- Research grants vs facilities. Not just data about researchers not being funded. How do you find optimum ratio of facilities with user slots to research grants using facilities

Contents

AAAC Report 2014

Draft Outline for the 2015 AAAC Report 2014

Executive Summary (< 1page)
Collected Findings and Recommendations (1 page)
1) Introduction (1-2 pages, includes brief summary of demographics work)
2) Science Highlights (1 page List of well-publicized scientific results, expanded in Appendix A)
3) Status of Decadal Survey Programs and Recommendations (5-7 pages)
    Overview
    NWNH Priorities and Recommendations
    P5 Priorities and Recommendations
    Major Programs currently under construction (and their relationship to NWNH and P5). How to do SOFIA?
    Preparation for Mid-Decadal Review (comments on budget scenarios)
5) Interagency Cooperation (cooperation on P5 and NWNH, responsibilities for mid-decadal.) 1 page
6) Budgets and Budget Impact (2-3 pages)
    Overview
    Status of Portfolio Review – divestiture progress
    Pressure on individual investigator grants and mid-scale programs
    Reviewer Load
    Other ? How do "Principles" help alleviate impact by globalization? Progress towards open access?
7) Report of Demographics working group (1-3 pages)
    Define working group and what was done
    Present possible solutions
    Report on any "evidence" from these solutions tried elsewhere
    Present clear set of questions (pre-screened to be answerable) to evaluate their potential success
    Present a process by which the data is collected and disseminated.

Appendices: Advances in Science, 2015 budgets, Definition of Acronyms