

Panelist assignments

Overview

- The panel will evaluate ~110 proposals.
- Each proposal discussed at panel will have 4 assigned panelists: 1 Primary, 1 Scribe, and 2 Readers.
 - **Primary** panelists read the proposal, write a review, and help evaluate whether the proposal should be discussed at panel. At panel, primary panelists lead the discussion and help with the panel summary.
 - **Scribe** panelists read the proposal thoroughly and help evaluate whether the proposal should be discussed at panel. You are encouraged to write a review, but this is entirely optional. At panel, scribes contribute to the discussion and lead the writing of the panel summary.
 - **Readers** are responsible for reading the proposal and reviews thoroughly before the panel meets. At panel, readers contribute to the panel discussion and help with the panel summary.
 - **At the end of each proposal discussion, all 4 assigned panelists will individually rate the proposal.**
- We do not expect panelists to be equally familiar with all proposal topics. Primary and Scribe assignments will generally be closer to your expertise than Reader assignments. In cases where assignments are not a perfect match with your expertise, your input will be valuable in a broader context and you may have additional insights on the reviews.
- You do not have any reviewing responsibilities for proposals that are not assigned to you in one of the above three categories. However, you may elect to participate in the panel discussion for any proposal for which you are not in conflict.

Review Writing Tips

- It is not necessary to summarize the proposal.
- Provide an informative narrative that addresses both NSF Merit Review Criteria: Intellectual Merit and Broader Impacts. Detailed instructions on the review criteria are available here: https://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/merit_review/
- Rate the proposal. Your evaluation should clearly support your chosen rating, especially in the case of ratings of Excellent and Poor.
- Be aware of and avoid implicit biases (gender, ethnic, racial, professional, personal).
- Submit reviews in FastLane using the Panel Review System.

Guidance for panel week

Confirmation of the non-discussion list (Monday morning)

- Primary and scribe panelists should be prepared to state whether or not you agree or disagree with the non-discussion designation of any proposal you are assigned.
- Panelists may also make additional ND suggestions at this time.

Proposal discussion process (20 minutes of discussion time is scheduled for each proposal)

1. The Program Officer introduces the proposal and ensures that conflicted individuals leave the room.
2. The Primary panelist provides a brief overview of the proposal and reviews. Informative and efficient delivery of comments keeps us on schedule. Please aim to complete this overview in six minutes or less.
 - Start with a short synopsis of objectives of the proposal.
 - Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of both the intellectual merit and broader impacts.
 - Summarize the main points from the ad hoc reviews; address wide spread ratings or outlier reviews.
 - Give your overall evaluation of the proposal.
 - Comment on whether or not the data management plan is in line with OCE or NSF requirements.
 - If there is postdoctoral funding, comment on whether or not the mentoring plan is adequate.
3. Scribe and Readers comments should provide **additional** insights on the merit of the research and note any other highlights from the reviews. This can include reinforcement of points already made, but not repeating them in detail. Questions and discussion are appropriate, but remember to be efficient.
4. Any unassigned panelist interested in the proposal can comment or ask questions.
5. Before discussion concludes, **the Scribe should ensure they have recorded the important points** so they can write the Panel Summary. Instructions for writing panel summaries will be provided at the beginning of panel deliberations.
6. Each assigned panelist will provide a rating and then we move on to the next proposal.
7. Panels for the four Ocean Sciences programs (Physical, Chemical, Biological Oceanography, and Marine Geosciences) occur simultaneously and allow for joint discussions of interdisciplinary proposals. Proposals that cross disciplinary boundaries within Ocean Sciences (e.g. BO and MGG) are co-reviewed in a joint panel discussion. If you are assigned to one of these you will discuss this with colleagues from the other panel in a different room. You are asked to assess the biological aspects of the proposal. Typically the discussion will alternate between panelists from the two (or more) panels. Try to limit your comments to aspects that have not already been stated, as these discussions often go longer than necessary.

Discussion tips:

- Each proposal must be evaluated on its own merit, therefore **avoid comparisons with other proposals**.
- **Budgets** should be discussed if they seem inappropriately high or low for the work proposed. Otherwise, such discussions are not time well spent.
- **Ship time and expenses** are fair game and important. While ships come out of a separate budget, they are a real expense and a finite resource that should weigh into consideration of funding. If you consider the ship expense too little bang for the buck, then we want to know it.

Panel wrap up (Friday)

- A summary of the highest ranked proposals will be presented and discussed.
- You will be asked to identify which proposals you consider transformative or high risk/high reward. More information on NSF's definition of transformative research is available here: https://www.nsf.gov/about/transformative_research/index.jsp