

Welcome to the NSF Reviewer Experience Survey

This survey focuses on your experiences reviewing proposals that were submitted to the National Science Foundation (NSF). The Evaluation and Assessment Capacity (EAC) section at NSF sponsors this survey. Your participation is voluntary but critical to the success of NSF improvement efforts. Your decision to participate or not to participate in this survey will **not** adversely affect your role as a reviewer or consideration of your pending or future proposals.

This survey should take about 15 minutes to complete. Your responses will be captured and saved as they are entered. You may exit the survey at any time, and all your previous responses will be retained. When you return, you will start back up at the point at which you left. Any responses entered may be used for analysis regardless of completion status. The information you provide will be used for statistical purposes. **Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and are subject to safeguards as provided by the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. § 552a).**

Note: Do not use your browser "back" button while taking this survey, as it may result in the loss of your responses. Instead, use the blue navigation arrows that appear at the bottom of the survey page.

OMB Number: 3145-0215
Expiration Date: 8/31/2023

Survey Instrument

Section 1: Preliminaries

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q1. Our records show that you served as a reviewer for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title]. Is this correct?

- ☐ Yes **1**
- ☐ No **2**

If yes, continue to Q2.

If no, then send respondent to technical assistance and resolve promptly.

Q1a. Since September 1, 2022, approximately how many times (including this one) have you served as a reviewer for the Division of Chemistry (CHE) at NSF?

Numeric Response: minimum must be 1.

Section 2: Reviewer Experience

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q2. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], approximately how many hours did it take for you to read all assigned proposals and write and submit your reviews? Please do not count time spent travelling to or sitting in panels.

Answer:

[text box] hours

[NUMBER VALIDATION: "Please enter a value less than 1,000 and greater than zero; no decimals, please."]

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q3. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], when did you typically read proposals and write reviews of NSF proposals?

Answer:

- ☐ During normal working hours **1**
- ☐ Outside of normal working hours **2**
- ☐ Both during and outside normal working hours equally **3**

Q4. Does your employer view your participation as a reviewer (for NSF or other funding agencies) to be within the scope of your normal work duties, or outside the scope of your normal work duties?

Answer:

- ☐ Within the scope of my normal work duties **1**
- ☐ Outside the scope of my normal work duties **2**
- ☐ I don't know **3**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], in which of the following capacities did you serve? For reference,

- An **ad hoc** reviewer is someone who submits a written review of a proposal (usually more than one proposal) but does not participate in a discussion of the proposal with other reviewers.
- A **panelist**, or **panel** reviewer, is someone who participates in a discussion of a proposal (usually more than one proposal) with other reviewers. A panelist may or may not prepare a written review but has access to the reviews written by others. Panelists may meet face to face or remotely.

Answer:

- ☐ Served as an ad hoc reviewer **1**
- ☐ Served as a panelist/panel reviewer **2**
- ☐ Other (e.g., extended reviewer commitment or standing reviewer committee) **3**

If Q5 is "Served as a panelist/panel reviewer" or "Other," then ask Q5a – Q5g:

Q5a. Was your reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title] conducted in person or remotely?

Answer:

- ☐ Served as an in-person panelist **1**
- ☐ Served as a remote panelist **2**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5b. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many reviewers were similar to your own subject matter expertise or research area?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5c. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many other reviewers were similar to your own years of professional experience?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5d. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, describe any general discussions with fellow reviewers that were **most** relevant or helpful.

Answer:

Text box.

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5e. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, describe any general discussions with fellow reviewers that were **least** relevant or helpful.

Answer:

Text box.

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5f. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, describe any general strengths that different proposals shared as identified by you or fellow reviewers.

Answer:

Text box.

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q5g. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, describe any general weaknesses that different proposals shared as identified by you or fellow reviewers.

Answer:

Text box.

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q6. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how would you rank the overall quality of proposals you reviewed?

Answer:

- ☐ Very poor 1
- ☐ Poor 2
- ☐ Fair 3
- ☐ Good 4
- ☐ Very good 5
- ☐ Excellent 6

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q7. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how variable was the quality of proposals you reviewed?

Answer:

- ☐ Extremely variable 1
- ☐ Very variable 2
- ☐ Moderately variable 3
- ☐ Slightly variable 4
- ☐ None / Not at all 5

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q8. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], to the best of your recollection, how many proposals did you review that were submitted by PIs from doctoral universities with very high research activity, also referred to as R1 research institutions?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all 1
- ☐ Most 2
- ☐ Few 3
- ☐ Very few 4
- ☐ None 5
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall 6

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q9. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many proposals did you review that were submitted by PIs from an academic institution whose enrollment of minorities may exceed fifty percent of the total enrollment, including graduate and undergraduate and full- and part-time students, also referred to as minority serving institutions?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q10. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many proposals did you review that were submitted by PIs with more senior research tenure or professional experience?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q11. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many proposals did you review that were submitted by PIs with fewer years of professional experience or by those just starting their research career?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[auto fill instructions in question stem]

Q12. Thinking about your most recent reviewer experience for NSF program solicitation [auto fill #], [auto fill solicitation title], and to the best of your recollection, how many proposals were relevant to your own subject matter expertise and research area?

Answer:

- ☐ Almost all **1**
- ☐ Most **2**
- ☐ Few **3**
- ☐ Very few **4**
- ☐ None **5**
- ☐ I don't know / can't recall **6**

[SECTION: END]

You have reached the end of the survey.

If you wish to modify any of your responses, click the back arrow below. Otherwise, please click the forward button.

Thank You

Thank you for completing the survey!