

TAC report

Subaru UM 2006

K. Ohta
(Kyoto Univ.)
2007.01.30

outline

- Trend
- TAC members
- Process
- C2 problem
- Enquete report

trends

- Number of submitted proposals tends to decrease

S04A 164+4 (528/103+5 nights x5.1)

S04B 156+4 (533/105+6 nights x5.1)

S05A 137+2 (457/84+5 nights x5.4)

S05B 113+3 (369/78+3 nights x4.7)

S06A 143+2 (474/79+5 nights x6.0)

S06B 116+2 (371/88+3 nights x4.2)

S07A 123+2 (392/107+1 nights x3.7)

- Oversubscription 4-5
- Many nights / proposal
- Fixed applicants?
- ...

4th TAC members (2005.08-2007.07?)

- K. Ohta (Kyoto) chair
- S. Sasaki (NAO, Mizusawa)
- T. Nakajima (NAO, Mitaka)
- M. Hayashi (NAO, Hawaii)=>T. Nagata (Kyoto)
- T. Shigeyama (Tokyo)
- T. Kodama (NAO, Mitaka)
- Y. Yoshii (Tokyo)
- M. Chiba (Tohoku)
- M. Umemura (Tsukuba)

Process 1

- Category =>
8-9 groups each group includes about 20 proposals
- A-1 solar system, extra-solar system
- B-1 normal star
- B-2 star formation, ISM
- B-3 compact star, supernova, GRB
- C-1 clusters, gravitational lensing
- C-2 high-z galaxies, galaxy formation/evolution
- C-3 nearby galaxies
- C-4 AGNs/QSOs
- (C-5 deep surveys, QSO abs lines)

Process 2

- 5 referees for each group
- Usually three of them are japanese (staff, PDF)
- At least 4 referees review the proposal
- 5-rank relative evaluation
+ 3-rank 4 absolute check points
- Average calibrated relative score
- Comments are strongly recommended

Process 3

- Assign number of nights for each group (Kaken-hi style distribution)
- TAC reviews the proposals and approve mainly based on the referees' score
- Considering Min night, challenge, continuation etc
- Proposals with the highest-score tend to request many nights , so...

Process 4

- Rough time allocation
- Dark in March, April is very compete
- Technical comments from SS

Service observations

- Reviewed by TAC members (three referees for one proposal)
- 3-rank evaluation
- Observations are executed based on the scores and obs conditions
- After complete your observation, the results are informed to the applicant

C2 problem

- Many proposals up to 40 or less
- Overlapped fields
- TAC needs many referees
 - => very hard to assign referees
(refuse, PI/Cols)
- Random assignment to the 7? referees

Summary of the enquete for refereeing 1:proposal

- Call for proposal should be earlier than 1 month
- Text 2 pages+ figure/table additional 1-2pages

Summary of the enquete for refereeing 2:process

- Min max rejection or 3-sigma rejection
6-7 referees per proposal
- Famous(?) users tend to be passed preferentially?
- Double blind refereeing
- Conservative refereeing
=> evaluation of referees
- Comments to the referee
- Referees are poor, selection of referees is poor
- Challenging proposals (by TAC or young another TAC)
- Open numbers of application in each category(we did it)

Summary of the enquete for refereeing 3:refree's comments

- Referee comments are improved much!
(many comments)
- TAC comments are poor?
- Japanese referees are poor?
- Anti-correlation between comment and score

Summary of the enquete for refereeing 4:refree's comments

- Referee comments are improved much!
(many comments)
- TAC comments are poor?
- Japanese referees are poor?
- Anti-correlation between comment and score