

## Questions for DOE from the DPF Committee on Comparative Reviews

1. The committee would greatly benefit from a list of proposals funded in FY12, their funding level, activities supported, and personnel breakdowns (faculty, senior scientists, postdocs, students, technical, administrative).

What is the recent (10 year) history of university grants in terms of the number of grants and total funding. Is the university program shrinking, static, or growing relative to the OHEP budget?

What is the breakdown of funded proposals that were new starts? Categories that would be helpful include age; theory/experiment; university/other entities; existing DOE grant at the institution or not.

What is the breakdown of proposals which were declined, including large grants in which individual PI's were not funded. Categories of interest as above.

2. Did OHEP have a specific strategy in mind going into the review process? For example, did it have targets for the number of existing grants that would be renewed and the number of new grants that would be funded?

3. What guidance was given to the applicants? Were they made aware of the potential for dropping individual PIs, and of the critical assessment of Senior Research Scientists?

4. What was the charge given to the reviewers, both mail-in and panelists? Were they given information or guidance with respect to OHEP's expected outcomes?

5. Were specific instructions given to reviewers regarding Senior Research Scientists which were different than the instructions given for post docs or faculty members? If so, what were they? What was the profile of activities of the 11/20 research scientists whose funding was terminated?

6. What degree of uniformity was there among the several mail reviewers for a given proposal? Among the panel reviewers? How did program managers resolve varying assessments?

7. Were numerical scores assigned to each proposal, and if so how were the scores determined? Was there a hard cutoff, below which proposals were not funded? If numerical scores were assigned, could we see a distribution of the scores, and the cutoff value if there was one?

8. How were proposals assigned to reviewers? For example, was a single reviewer assigned only proposals of similar size, or only proposals in the same area, or were the assignments random? Were (for example) Energy Frontier proposals reviewed only by people working in the Energy Frontier, or was there a mix?

9. Did the reviewers have available to them any information from the leaders of their collaborations or from group leaders at labs to help them calibrate the contributions of groups or individuals?
10. Many groups contribute to detector development, to operations of ongoing experiments, or to accelerator-related activities. How were these contributions considered?
11. What provision does OHEP make for reviewing those grants or PIs that have multiple activities that cross the energy/intensity/cosmic boundaries? If a single PI was reviewed by different panels (due to his or her being involved in more than one area), how were the separate rankings from different panels handled, especially if they disagree?
12. When a specific PI was not funded, did all the students and post docs under him or her also lose funding? Are there any graduate students who will lose support so that they are unable to complete their degrees?
13. How were shared resources and infrastructure evaluated, especially for large grants that spanned more than one area?
14. The 2009 "Dear colleague" letter cited a criterion that asked for "alignment with programmatic goals". How is this criterion applied in practice? What would be the reaction to a proposal that seeks to establish some new direction in detectors or in physics experiment? How is it applied for theory proposals?
15. Is there a specific policy regarding funding of junior faculty in their first year and subsequent years as assistant professors?
16. For theorists, did the panels/DOE assign particular weights to different areas, such as phenomenology, QCD (collider related), model building, or String theory?
17. Based on the lessons learned from the first round of comparative reviews, what changes in the process if any do you plan to make for the next round?