# TAC workings

# HST Proposal Review

- Director of STScI is the formal allocating official
- Director relies on peer-review recommendations made by the Telescope Allocation Committee (TAC) (chairs of topical panels + TAC chair)
- Proposals are reviewed by topical panels (~14) that cover relatively broad scientific areas
- Panels: 9-11 members (small / medium), mainly from US institutions, 20% from ESA or other
- 25-30% of reviewers participated previously

# JWST Cycle 1

## JWST TAC logistics

- TAC meeting took place virtually on February 16-19 (10 Galactic panels), February 23-26 (8 Extragalactic panels) & March 1-4 2021 (Executive Committee – 2 TAC co-chairs)
  - ~200 astronomers from the community
  - 12 observers from NASA Project, ESA, CSA
  - Each panel supported by STScI staff members as panel support scientists and levelers
  - ~100 STScI staff in support – science policies, panel support staff, IT, instrumentation, scheduling, levelers
  - Multiple orientation sessions for STScI support staff, TAC Chairs & TAC panel members
    - Presentations all available on Jdox https://jwst-docs.stsci.edu/jwst-opportunities-and-policies/james-webb-space-telescope-science-policies-group-and-review-information/orientation-materials
- Each TAC panel had a dedicated bluejeans link and associated slack channel
  - Additional slack channels for observers, levelers, PSS, SPG, TAC co-chairs & others
- All proposals receive feedback on strengths and weaknesses
  - Extended deadline for completing comments (March 5 for panels, March 13 for exec Committee)

# Round 1: Triage

1. Outstanding; project must be done (if technically feasible).
2. Very Good; should be done (if technically feasible).
3. Good; worth doing if time permits.
4. Fair; lowest priority for implementation.
5. Unsatisfactory; not recommended for implementation.

- Preliminary rankings are no longer provided to the panels in advance of deliberations. Only used for triage.

# Proposals for Triage

Lowest 40% of panel/TAC proposals are marked for triage based on preliminary grades from panelists

Why do we do this?

- Time constraints
  - 80 proposals@15 mins = 1200 mins = 20 hours
  - 48 proposals@15 mins = 720 mins = 12 hours
- Optimization & efficiency
  - Spend time discussing the best proposals
  - Avoid discussing proposals that are very unlikely to be approved
- Fairness
  - Triaged proposals can be resurrected by **non-conflicted** panelists but…
  - Previously triaged proposals have rarely been approved

**Responsibilities for Everyone & Grading:**

**********

**1) Read all proposals in your panel. Spend NO MORE than 15 minutes per proposal**

The point is that in a real TAC situation you will need to read many (>70) proposals and won't have time to go through each in detail.

# HST

You can use one decimal place

For each assigned proposal you must submit a grade under EACH of the 3 categories
In-field
Out-of-field
Suitability

| Grade | Impact within the sub-field | Out-of-field impact | Suitability |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Potential for transformative results. | Transformative implications for one or more other sub-fields. | Science goals can only be achieved by observational or theoretical analysis of HST data. |
| 2 | Potential for major advancement. | Major implications for one or more other sub-fields. | Analysis of HST data offers major advantages over data from other facilities. |
| 3 | Potential for moderate advancement. | Some implications for one or more other sub-fields. | Analysis of HST data offers some advantages over data from other facilities. |
| 4 | Potential for minor advancement. | Minor impacts on other sub-fields. | Analysis of HST data offers minor advantages over data from other facilities. |
| 5 | Limited potential for advancing the field. | Little or no impact for other sub-fields. | Analysis of HST data offers little or no advantage over other facilities or the advantages of analysing HST data are unclear. |

1) Summarize the main goals of your assigned proposals

- - what are they trying to do :
- - what is the problem they are trying to solve?
- Why does that problem matter?
- what is the solution/proposal)?
- What are the data products?
-

2) Summarize your opinion of the proposal under two headings :

- What are the strengths?
- What are the weaknesses?

Examples:

- - Is the HST/facility usage justified?
- - Are the Data products clear?
- - Are the data products important to the subfield? broadly?
- - Are the science goals clear and well motivated?
- - what is confusing?
- - is it well-written?
- - will it impact the field? (will the results be useful to the community)
- - are the goals reasonable/do-able?