

K. ALATALO AND B. BLACKER

JWST CYCLE 1 LEVELER ORIENTATION

ADOPTED CHANGES TO THE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION PROCESS

- ▶ Proposers will craft their PDF submissions to be anonymous in accordance with proposer guidelines.
- ▶ Exclude names or affiliations of the proposing team in the PDF submission (incl. figures and personal websites).
- ▶ Cite all references in the 3rd person (incl. references to data and software).
- ▶ Make reasonable effort to anonymize their submissions.
- ▶ Proposers will be required to submit a Team Expertise and Background section with their Phase I submission. This section will not be anonymous, and will be used in a final check.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE PEER REVIEW

- ▶ **Consider proposals solely on the scientific merit of what's proposed.** Follow the evaluation criteria we have provided.
- ▶ Do not spend any time attempting to identify the PI or the team.
- ▶ In the panel discussions leading to the scientific ranking, do not make guesses on identities, insinuate the likely identities, or instigate discussion on their past work—there will be an appropriate time for this later.
- ▶ Language is key—utilize the appropriately neutral pronouns (e.g., “what they propose”, or “the team has evaluated data from a C23 program”).
- ▶ Identify proposals that are not compliant with the anonymizing guidelines.

THE ROLE OF LEVELERS

- ▶ Levelers are present to keep the panel discussions focused on scientific merit. Unlike the chairs, you are not listening for issues pertaining to the science, rather you are focused on the discussion itself.
- ▶ If the discussion veers to comments on the proposing team, their past work, their validity, or their identities, the leveler's job is to refocus that discussion.
- ▶ YOU have the **authority** to stop the discussion on a proposal.
- ▶ If, in the deliberation of a given proposal, an investigator's self-revealed identity becomes impossible to ignore, and that identity has a clear impact on the discussion, the proposal should be flagged for disqualification. The levelers may bring this to the attention of the panel if they feel this threshold has been crossed.

WHAT TO LISTEN FOR: MISBEHAVING PANELISTS

- ▶ Panelists should not make guesses on identities, insinuate the likely identities, or instigate discussion on their past work
- ▶ **Consider proposals solely on the scientific merit of what's proposed.** Follow the evaluation criteria we have provided you.
- ▶ Language is key— utilize the appropriately neutral pronouns (e.g., “what they propose”, or “the team has evaluated data from a C23 program”).
- ▶ Do not spend any time attempting to identify the PI or the team.

We will have a slack channel to facilitate discussion amongst levelers, and call for help if need be.

WHAT TO LISTEN FOR: COMPLIANCE WITH ANONYMIZING GUIDELINES

- ▶ Proposals that have egregiously violated these rules should have already been brought to the attention of the SPG and flagged for disqualification prior to the meeting.
- ▶ Less serious cases (a stray “we” or “our”) should be also be pointed out. Panelists should attempt to ignore these less flagrant errors whenever possible, and keep focused on the scientific merits.
- ▶ Cases that are too difficult to ignore (levelers could be important in making that decision), or not sufficiently anonymized, should be commented on in the recommendations to the Director, and may be disqualified.
- ▶ Panelists should provide specific feedback in their comments to proposers if a proposal was not sufficiently made anonymous.

WHAT TO LISTEN FOR: CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

- ▶ In some ways conflicts are somewhat easier—no need for “major” and “minor” categories. When a person is conflicted, they leave the “room”.
- ▶ We will rely more on self-identified conflicts (i.e., interpersonal, close collaborators, competitors and competing proposals). We will continue to track collaborative/competitive conflicts, etc. and may declare some conflicts in advance.
- ▶ As a panelist, if they strongly suspect they have a conflict with a given proposal, **then they are conflicted**. However, keep in mind that anonymizing process will make it very tough to know for certain who the proposers are.
- ▶ Levelers should push the conflicted to leave the “room”, no discussion.

TEAM EXPERTISE AND BACKGROUND

- ▶ JWST time should be openly available to any scientist who presents a highly compelling scientific case. However that time is a highly valued resource that must be used responsibly.
- ▶ After the scientific ranking, the panel will then review the credentials of the teams on only the proposals they recommend (above their orbit-allocation line).
- ▶ Panels will be given the lists of proposal investigators, alphabetized and the Team Expertise and Background sections. The panel should review the materials for ~20 mins or as needed.
- ▶ Panelists should raise specific proposals for discussion. If there are clear, compelling deficiencies in the expertise required to see through the goals of the proposal, panel must decide by consensus to flag the submission for disqualification, and provide a detailed justification in their comments to the Director.

TEAM EXPERTISE AND BACKGROUND

- ▶ The criteria for sufficient expertise is left to the panels in order to evaluate cases as necessary (e.g., particularly difficult datasets, difficult analyses, or programs of exceptionally high risk).
- ▶ General inexperience with JWST data should not, in itself, be a disqualifier. Nor should the failure to publish past datasets, unless there's an extraordinary issue with the team's publication history.
- ▶ **Proposals can only be eliminated in this final review. It will not be used to re-evaluate or upgrade programs below the nominal allocation line.**
- ▶ If a panel should choose to essentially disqualify a proposal after the scientific ranking, that panel effectively loses those orbits.
- ▶ **If it seems a panel is going to eliminate a proposal, call in SPG.**

SCHEDULE

- BlueJeans Meetings with devoted Slack channels
 - 16-19th February for Galactic Panels
 - 22-25th February for Extra-Galactic Panels
 - 10AM - 4PM (NOMINALLY), Chairs have discretion

EXTRA SLIDES