

# HST dual anonymous review process

Experience as panel support staff and levelers:  
Crystal Mannfolk, Gregory Snyder, Svea Hernandez



# History of Support and Anonymity

- Early on, reviewers were able to see who all of the investigators were.
- We then begin hiding who the PI was on a given proposal, but still reported the investigator's names and institutions.
- In both cases, the discussion during the grading portion of the panel meetings tended to stray from the science, and onto investigator expertise.
- Levelers were introduced only recently, and before that it was up to the Panel Support Staff and Panel Chair to keep the discussion focussed on the science.

# Prepping for Panel Support

- 2-3 meetings a few hours each to get the TAC support, and levelers trained and familiar with the new anonymous process and software tools.
- *“Make sure the scientific discussion is based on the science and not the possible investigators”* - This was the primary job of the “levelers”
- Set the rules of the process before it begins:
  - ➡ Are the panelists accessing the names of the PIs, Cols at any point?
  - ➡ Do they have the option of requesting such information?
  - ➡ At which point should the TAC support grant the panelist access to this information?

# During the Review Process

- During the Cycle 27 process, some panelists pointed out that there was more diversity and inclusion amongst the panelists, especially with participation from many junior astronomers.
- In general, there were little or no deviating conversations discussing the proposers or investigators.
- Panelists were not really interested in biasing their scientific opinions with the PI/Col information
- Even after finalizing their “approved” proposals list, panelist opted for keeping the PI/Col information anonymous