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Foreword

It is with great pleasure that we share this, our third, ‘Grant Panel Members Satisfaction Survey’.

The seven UK Research Councils and UK SBS work in partnership to deliver research funding that has an impact on the growth, prosperity and wellbeing of the UK. In running our grants processes, we believe that it is absolutely critical to ensure that those who use them have a positive experience, whoever they are and whatever their interaction with us. This third survey of panel members has helped us to understand your current experience and to determine whether changes made following your previous feedback have provided a more positive experience.

The responses we have had this year, a total of 1,157 (34.1% of those approached (3,393)), has been a slight decrease on the 2014 survey (1,209 (40.7% of those approached)) and it is great to see your active participation.

We have been very pleased to receive a large amount of positive feedback amongst these responses, translating to an overall satisfaction score of 4.2 out of 5, an increase in satisfaction compared with our previous survey of 4 out of 5 in 2014. This improvement is further supported by your views that time spent preparing for and attending at our panel meetings is time well spent, which was the view of the majority of the returns we received.

However, we would of course like to see a higher satisfaction score and there are a number of areas where the respondents have identified some opportunities to enhance the Panel Member experience. This report outlines a number of actions that aim to convert this valuable feedback into improvements over the coming months and that are all being considered in conjunction with the new Grants Funding programme under development as well as the creation of our new organisation ‘UK Research & Innovation (UKRI)’ in April 2018. We intend to make the outputs of those actions visible to our stakeholders as they are rolled out.

Continuity with this dialogue with our grants community is extremely valuable to us and we would like to extend our most sincere thanks to those who have contributed to this survey and, of course, for the time and expertise you provide.

Chris Gosden
STFC
Chair of Grants Operations Group

Allan Wood
UK SBS
Head of Grants
Section 1: Participation

Overall, a total of 3,393 Panel Members were approached to take part in the survey. A total of 1,157 (34%) responses were received. This compares with a response rate of 40% in 2014 and 32.9% in 2013.

It has to be noted that Questions 4 to 8 (inclusive) were not posed in the 2013 and 2014 surveys, therefore there is no data to make a comparison for these questions.

1. Within the last 18 months, for which Research Council have you most frequently participated in panel meetings?

The Panel Members were asked about their involvement with the Research Councils’ meetings.

Although the actual volume of responses differ per council, with EPSRC receiving the most with 418 and NC3R the least with 2, the share of responses from the number of Panel Members approached by each council is a much narrower range with EPSRC and ESRC receiving a 36.00% response rate, with AHRC (35.94%) and STFC (35.47%) very close behind.

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right. When comparing the year on year data between 2014 and 2016, responses at client level show a slight increase for AHRC and a decrease for all other Research Councils with a decrease of 14% for BBSRC and STFC. For NC3R, there was no data in the 2014 report to provide a comparison year on year.
2. How many meetings have you participated in for this Research Council over the last 3 years?

![Bar chart showing meeting attendance by Research Councils.](chart)

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right.

49% of overall responses are from members who have attended 2 to 5 meetings. EPSRC have the highest volume (17%) with all the other RCs (with the exception of NC3Rs) having a share of the remaining 32%.

36% of overall responses are from members who have attended 1 meeting. EPSRC have the highest volume (18%) with all the other RCs (with the exception of NC3Rs) having a share of the remaining 19%.

15% of the overall responses are from members who have attended more than 5 meetings. MRC have the highest volume (4%) with all the other RCs (with the exception of NC3Rs) having a share of the remaining 11%.

![Bar chart showing year-on-year comparison.](chart)

Comparing the data from the 2014 survey, there has been a 7% increase in the number of Panel Members attending 1 meeting, with a 1% decrease in those Panel Members attending 2 to 5 meetings, and a decrease of 5% in the more than 5 category, which may be an indication of an increase in new Panel Members, with the swing over to those attending 1 meeting.
3. As a Panel Member, how satisfied have you been with each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from our staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of papers for the meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about your role at the meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the participants provided a high volume of 'Satisfied' and 'Very satisfied' responses with 84% (circa 1157) and 1% of respondents selecting 'Very dissatisfied'.

The legend for both graphs moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic arrangements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from our staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the papers e.g. proposals, reviews and supporting papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of papers for the meeting e.g. proposals, reviews and supporting papers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about your role at the meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing responses year on year with the 2014 and the 2013 surveys, with the exception of 'Provision of papers' which has remained static at around 40% there has been a decrease year on year in the 'Very satisfied' in all categories.

Again with the exception of 'Provision of papers' where the percentage had a minor decrease, there has been a slight increase in the percentage of 'Very dissatisfied' responses for all other categories.

Below are some of the additional comments which participants provided on the subject of 'Panel Papers'

**Panel papers**

"I had most of the information I needed to support my assessment and recommendations in advance of the meeting. However, several papers including responses to referees were provided within 24 hours of the start of the meeting, after I'd begun my travel so it was impossible to review them. Papers should not be sent to panel members less than 1 week in advance of the meeting."

"Last minute papers are a problem. They don't get proper consideration."
"Paperwork is great, not all of it arrives in sufficient time to read!"

"Some proposals to be reviewed were only available 12 hours before the panel meeting."

"Sometimes late papers are very late - i.e. available at the meeting or immediately before, and sometimes the other IM scores aren't available. I think there is too much paperwork in BBSRC proposals and too many separate bits of information. I think we could still judge which are the top 25% proposals with much less information."
4. Over the last two years Research Councils have rolled out the use of the Peer Review Extranet for providing meeting papers. How satisfied have you been with this system?

The participants were asked to provide their assessment of 5 areas. Overall, the participants provided 65% (circa 1157), of 'Satisfied' and 'Very satisfied' responses, with 7% of 'Dissatisfied' and 'Very dissatisfied' responses.

'Support from Staff' attained 81% and 'Accessibility' 69% of 'Satisfied' and 'Very satisfied'. 'Ease of use' attained 19% and 'Finding information' 16% of 'Dissatisfied' and 'Very dissatisfied'. This clearly shows there is room for improvement in the areas of both 'Ease of use' and 'Finding Information'.

The graphs below provide a more detailed breakdown by the 5 categories which the participants were asked to assess.
5. How satisfied were you with the quality of the hotel accommodation?

Of the 1,157 respondents, 69% (803) confirmed that they used hotel accommodation provided by RCUK and went on to rank how satisfied they were with this. Respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction level with 5 ratings with a sliding scale from 'Very satisfied', 'Satisfied', 'Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', 'Dissatisfied', and 'Very dissatisfied'.

3% (29) gave a ranking of 'Very dissatisfied'.

2% (25) gave a ranking of 'Dissatisfied'.

9% (95) gave a ranking of 'Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

37% (400) gave a ranking of 'Satisfied'.

23% (254) of respondents who use the hotel accommodation gave a ranking of 'Very satisfied'.

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right.

6. What are your priorities when considering accommodation?

Respondents were asked to rank the following areas in order of priority when considering accommodation;

Wi-Fi
Hotel/Local Facilities
Easy to get to for meeting location
Standard of bedroom
Opportunities for networking
Convenient travel links

'Easy to get to for the meeting location' attained 61% and 'Convenient travel links' attained 47% of the highest ranking of Very satisfied and Satisfied.

'Opportunities for networking' attained 70% and 'Hotel/Local Facilities' 46% of the lowest rating of Dissatisfied and Very Dissatisfied. This determines location and travel links are the Panel members highest priority with networking and Hotel/ local facilities as their lowest priority when considering accommodation.
7. How satisfied were you with the meeting venue?

Respondents were asked to rank their satisfaction level with a sliding scale from 'Very dissatisfied', 'Dissatisfied', 'Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied', 'Satisfied' and 'Very satisfied'.

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right.

91% (1,050) of Panel Members responded indicating their level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the quality of venue and hospitality provided.

Overall 84% (883) of respondents gave a ranking of 'Satisfied' or 'Very satisfied', which is a very positive result.

10% (104) of respondents gave a ranking of 'Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied'.

6% (63) gave a ranking of 'Dissatisfied' or 'Very dissatisfied'.

Of the 1,050 participants who provided a score 58% (612) took the opportunity to submit the name of the venue, with the same venues coming in the top and bottom 3 venues in the rankings, which we can conclude people were just as likely to be satisfied as dissatisfied with these venues;

Polaris House (Swindon), Kemble Street (MRC) and St David's Hotel (Cardiff).

The Panel Members took the opportunity to provide some additional comments;

"Polaris House - but would prefer meetings in locations that are more accessible (e.g. Central London or Birmingham or Manchester)"

"The EPSRC room we had during the first day of interviews was too small"

"Swindon meetings good. London meetings 'okay' - the food is less good at the London venue I feel."

"The 13th floor meeting room in London is not ideal for panel meetings"

"Polaris House - poor temperature control in meeting rooms!"

"most of my meetings are remote panel. Meeting rooms in Swindon are satisfactory if rather cramped and not enough charger plugs - main problem is that it is not easy to get to Swindon"
8. What are your priorities for a meeting venue?

Panel members were asked to rank their priorities relating to meeting venues based on five options provided – 1 being the highest priority and 5 the lowest.

N.B. Due to rounding of the percentages, two of the charts total 101%.

Attaining the highest rankings of 1 and 2 were 'Convenient Travel Links (61%) and General environment' (56%), with 'Good Wi-Fi connection' (34%) and 'Catering' (84%) attaining the lowest of the rankings of 4 and 5, which tells us that 'Travel links' and 'Environment far outweigh 'Wi-Fi' and 'Catering' when it comes to the meeting venue and the Panel Members priorities.
9. Were the expenses you incurred whilst attending the Panel Meeting reimbursed in a reasonable time?

When asked whether their expenses were settled in a reasonable amount of time, 90% (944) of respondents indicated they had submitted expenses, with 91% (859) confirming their expenses were reimbursed in a reasonable time and 9% (85) confirming they were 'Not paid in a reasonable time' which is a 3.9% improvement on the previous survey.

However from the free text comments received on the subject of payment, Panel Members aired concerns and disquiet around the level of payment and the lack of respect for Panel Members. Some of these comments are appended below.

"More subtle point: The question asks about promptness of payment of expenses; this is generally reasonable. However, there is no inquiry about payment of fees, which is slow to the point that one doubts if they are going to be paid. This does not signal that the Panel members efforts are valued."

"Panel members are sometimes treated by RCUK staff as if RCUK is doing them a huge favour rather than as valued contributors. Some staff at RCUK does not seem to realise that panel members have plenty of other choices of what to do with their time and other more prestigious activities to dedicate their time to, and that the payment they receive from RCUK is really negligible compared to how they can get paid by other funding agencies (e.g., EC). Therefore, panel members do their work almost on a voluntary basis and spend a lot of time on it, so this needs to be deeply valued. I have never been thanked properly for my efforts and I think RCUK should make more of an effort to do so and to train their staff to see panel members as very valuable."

"I enjoy being part of the panel process and as a non-academic find it a good way of staying abreast of research activity and trends. However, as someone who is essentially self-employed I feel that my receiving the same honorarium as a salaried academic (who is almost certainly being funded by RCUK for their core time) is unfair to persons like myself who are (effectively) self employed and potentially forgoing income to attend meetings. This disquiet is compounded as the system only pays an honorarium for time in the meeting and hence does not seem to recognise the substantial preparation time needed."

"I think the academics on panels could be treated with a little more generosity, if not in terms of pay (which probably ends up being at about minimum wage levels) then in terms of making them feel valued through (1) sending them hard copies of all papers rather than expecting them to do the printing, with the extra time that takes, and (2) greater generosity about catering and allowing necessary amount of money on expense to cover meals. (We had an experience on a panel where no biscuits could be provided during the morning break, because of some cost-saving rule)."
10. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

This question was not posed in previous surveys, and therefore we have no data to make a comparison.

**At the Panel Meeting, I have all the information that I need to support my assessment and/or recommendations**

- Strongly Agree: 35%
- Agree: 57%
- Neither Agree or disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 2%
- Strongly Disagree: 1%

**My time in the panel is used efficiently to ensure that I input into the discussions**

- Strongly Agree: 36%
- Agree: 56%
- Neither Agree or disagree: 5%
- Disagree: 2%
- Strongly Disagree: 1%

**Finding information within the proposal and associated documents is straightforward**

- Strongly Agree: 18%
- Agree: 51%
- Neither Agree or disagree: 20%
- Disagree: 10%
- Strongly Disagree: 2%

N.B. Due to rounding, the above chart totals 101%.

The Panel Members were provided with 3 statements and asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statements.

The majority (92%) of Panel Members either 'Strongly agreed' or 'Agreed' that they had 'the information needed to support their assessment and/or recommendations' and their 'time in the panel is used efficiently', which is a decrease of 5% when compared to 97% in the 2013 and 2014 surveys.

However the responses varied when asked whether 'finding information within the proposal and associated documents is straightforward', with 69% of Panel Members selecting either 'Strongly agreed' or 'Agreed' and 20% selecting 'Neither agree or disagree' and 12% selecting 'Disagree' or
Appended below are additional comments which participants provided in regards to the 'Application'.

**Application**

"The current paperwork for each proposal is excessive, not well presented, duplicated in parts and fails to tell a coherent proposition concisely. The whole system of calling for proposals, the guidance for applicants and the resulting applications need review and overhaul in order to make the assessment process less time-consuming and more effective."

"Most of the non-financial content of the JeS form is useless to reviewers and is just a burden on the applicants. If this information is required from the applicants then it should be collected post-award."

"One has to wade through a lot of routine information that the RC will assess (e.g. use of animals, equality). The template could be structured better."

"The vast amount of paper per proposal can be detrimental in making a fully informed decision. Perhaps the use of more concise summary documents should be encouraged. For example, for the applicant: get rid of most of the sections (except the finances) of the outline document (as it's usually a reduced copy of the six page CfS) and replace it by one summary page. Ditto for reviewers - a summary page them clearly stating their positive and negative views. Finally, change the scores by reviewers from 1-10 (in line with the panel scores) instead of 1-6. We all know that anything less than a 5 potentially kills off a proposal!"

"There are a lot of documents and a great deal is irrelevant. Every mathematics proposal comes with five pages in which the proposer declares that the procedure will not harm any mice, rats, rabbits, horses, kangaroos, fruit flies, squid or unicorns, and budgets that tell you the rail fare from Newcastle to Manchester. We do not need that level of detail at the panel meetings, and we do not need the bit about unicorns at all."
11. Please select below ways in which you think Panel Meetings and your experience could be improved.

Panel members were given a variety of preferences of which they could make one or more selections.

![Bar chart showing the following improvements:]
- N/A - Meetings run fine as they are
- Better management of the volume of papers going to each meeting
- Improved support for new Panel members
- Better balance of expertise
- Equal influence of all Panel Members
- Defined role of non-academic member
- Better use of telephone/video conferencing options
- Better chairing of meeting
- Better meeting management

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the graph is from left to right.

Comparing this data with the 2 previous years surveys the following remain high on the list for improvement:
- 24% for "Better management of volumes of papers" with 7.4% in 2014 and 11% in 2013 surveys
- 11% for "Improved support for new Panel members" with 4% in 2014 and 3% in 2013 surveys
- 16% for "Better balance of expertise" with 4% in 2014 survey and no comparison available in the 2013 survey

Below are some of the additional comments which participants provided on the subject of 'Panel Management':

Panel Management
"It is not clear whether panel members are meant to read all applications and reviews or only those allocated to them."

"My experience was that the panel chair (BBSRC C) acted in a manner that could be perceived as very biased in the meeting and did not disclose transparently enough that he was a co-investigator on the grant that was under consideration at the very same panel. By the virtue of ordering of the grant discussions his grant came up towards the end of the second day of considerations and it became clear that it could be perceived as beneficial to him to talk down all the other grants in the panel that were considered before that. I feel it needs to be made absolutely transparent in the opening discussions/instructions/paperwork of the panel before anything gets discussed which panel members have grants pending in the panel either as PI or CoI."

"It is difficult to rank proposals which others have reviewed and in different subfields. Things can get random quite easily."

"It was my first panel so unsure of expectations - my "homework" notes didn't quite met the demands of the meeting, even with the rating/ranking info - a worked example where an experienced review had made notes and comments and done a ranking would have been really helpful"

"It was too much like horse trading for my liking. And one person can really skew the outcomes of a panel."
2014 - ways in which your experience of being a Panel Member could be improved.

2013 Categories - Ways to improve Panel Members experience

- Earlier distribution of papers: 11%
- Harmonise scoring/evaluation: 10%
- Provide strong committee Chair: 6%
- Provide stronger guidance: 6%
- Clarify/provide funding outcome: 4%
- Smaller, more focused panels: 4%
- Provide additional support for new members: 3%
- Disqualify late papers: 3%
- Increase panel expertise/better allocation: 2%
- Focus more on the science: 3%
- Valorisation of members' contribution: 2%
- Undertake pre-screening: 1%
- Improve clarity of conflicts: 1%
- Positive experience overall: 19%
- No trend identified: 25%

Positive experience overall: 16.6%
12. How would you rate your experience as a Panel Member?

89% (1,031) of respondents rated their experience as a panel member. For this they were asked to select between 1 and 5 with 1 being Very dissatisfied to 5 being Very satisfied.

Of these respondents 86% (890) selected either 'Very satisfied' or 'Satisfied'. It is encouraging to see that only 3% were 'Dissatisfied' and 1% 'Very dissatisfied'.

When compared to 2013 (7%) and 2014 (6%), we can see there has been a 2% decrease in the dissatisfied area.

N.B. Due to the use of whole numbers, the %s for BBSRC, MRC and STFC do not add up to 100%.

NC3R (100%) and MRC (98%) Panel Members provided a positive response with 'Very satisfied' or 'Satisfied' combined.

On the opposite end of the scale ESRC and STFC Panel Members provided a 6% dissatisfied response.
13. How would you say your experience of being a Panel Member for the Research Councils has changed over the past 12 months?

Panel Members were asked how their experience has changed over the last 12 months, with the largest share of responses given over to 'Stayed the same' 39.22% (404) and 'Don't know' 30.58% (315).

20% (208) 'Slightly Improved'.
6% (60) 'Significantly improved'.
4% (38) 'Slightly worse'.
0.49% (5) 'Significantly worse'.

When compared to the 2014 survey, there has been a 5% shift from 'Stayed the same' into 'Don't know'. We have also seen a decrease in 'Significantly worse', from 1.3% in 2014 to 0.49% in this survey.

By looking at responses at client level, it is interesting to see an indication of significant improvement for all councils with MRC (11.83%) and BBSRC (10.14%).

Further charts provide a clearer picture by client year on year. When compared with the 2014 survey there appears to be some improvement in the lower end of the scale for three of the Research Councils, with;

BBSRC moving from 2% to 0%.
ESRC from 2% to 0%.
MRC from 4% to 1%.

The exception to this is NERC who, in the area of 'Significantly worse' have moved from 0% in 2014 to 1% in 2016.

N.B. Due to rounding up, some of the percentages do not add up to 100%.
14. How does your experience of the RCUK/UK SBS decision making process compare to your experience with other decision making organisations?

89% (1030) of the 1157 respondents indicated they had been involved with other decision making organisations and this is broken down by client in the chart below, with Panel Members from just one council (AHRC) stating when they compare their experience with other decision making organisations 6.82% of AHRC Panel Members said AHRC were "much better than other organisations", which compares to STFC where 9.62% of their Panel Members stated STFC were "worse that other organisations".

When we compare this to the 2014 survey results we have seen a decrease of just 4% in the "worse than other organisations" category and an increase of just under 4% in the "much better than other organisations" category.

In the category for "about the same as other organisations", there has been a decrease of just under 9%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCUK/UK SBS vs Other decision making organisations</th>
<th>Much worse than other organisations</th>
<th>Much Better than other organisations</th>
<th>Worse than other organisations</th>
<th>I have not been involved with other decision making organisations</th>
<th>Better than other organisations</th>
<th>About the same as other organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shares</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Due to the use of whole numbers, the %s for BBSRC, ESRC, NERC and STFC do not add up to 100%.

The legend for the graph moves from top to bottom and the data within the graph is also from top to bottom.
15. If you would like to provide any other comments to support any of your answers or would just like to provide some additional feedback please use the text box below.

When asked about their overall experience as a RCUK/UK SBS panel member, for any improvements that could be made and also how their experience compared with other decision-making organisations.

There were 290 free text comments, of those 72 (24%) commented they felt like they had had a good experience. Only 7 (2%) commented they did not have a good experience.

The remainder had various comments:
43 (14%) thought the overall process could be improved
36 (12%) thought improvements could / should be made in the way papers are accessed
24 (8%) thought the balance of Panel members / expertise was not right and should be addressed
18 (6%) did not like the location / or thought the location was difficult to get to
17 (5%) thought the scoring system needed to be improved or was scored differently from one person to another
16 (5%) thought there was an issue with the lack of Fees and also the demand on time where there was a correlation between the two views

Other comments about poor facilities, making better use of video conferencing technology, improving feedback, better triaging, improving the quality of reviews, overall lack of funds available to support science and improved guidance to Panel Members all fell below 2% of the remaining comments.

These comments have been divided into 5 themes Reviewer information, Extranet, Application, Panel Papers and Panel Management.

The comments regarding Reviewer information and the Extranet are appended below. The comments regarding Application, Panel Papers and Panel Management, have been appended to the relevant sections in the survey.

Reviewer information

"It can be difficult to identify the relevant information within reviewers' comments. I am unconvinced that the current multi-box section that is used by BBSRC is helpful. Often the same information gets repeated by reviewers over and over in separate boxes, and/or boxes are left blank. Perhaps a smaller number of boxes with a clearer message about what is required would help both panel members and make it easier for reviewers to understand what information is required (possibly increasing the reviewer response rate).

"It would be good to get a summary of reviewer scores in the running order spreadsheet. Working with very large pdfs is cumbersome, but there is no way round that that I know of."

"It would be helpful to have access to evaluation reports for previous completed projects when assessing repeat or similar applications."

"It would be useful to be more consistent about the number of reviews a proposal receives. It can be quite difficult balancing one proposal that has 3 reviews against another with 6+ reviews.

"It would be useful to see the evaluations by the other panel members ahead of the meeting. The proposals cover a very wide range, and it is difficult to judge proposals fairly that are not very close to one’s expertise."
Extranet

"A "download all" button on the proposal portal to read the documents offline would be useful"

"Helpful if all the applications which will be in the discussion zone for the meeting could be placed into a separate part of the extranet, for easier access Application"

"Helpful if grants could be named with applicant as well as number - with 30 plus grants of similar number it is often difficult to identify the right files Panel papers"

"It's great to have pdfs, but for moving around reviewers/reviews/proposals, it still means managing a bunch of documents rather than have quick online views of for instance assigned proposals, reviewers asked per proposal, who reviewed what, links to documents - in other words the uber navigation moving through proposals is not much better than paper. So the affordances of digital are not being used yet. This lack of online coordination - of, for instance, online forms for uploading comments as completed on a review - also meant managing a bunch of word files that meant that files did not get forwarded with responses. Similarly, it was not entirely clear that the forms would be required not only for FIRST responses but for second and third responses - an overview doc, tracking things completed or not, or what bits of what reviews remained, would be extremely helpful. With google docs for instance, there is a way to work offline and then save to online when a connection is available - using this approach these forms/reviews/overviews would be grand."

"The way in which the information is supplied makes printing out very time consuming. In other words, each bit of each document is locked with a password. I would prefer to have either (1) everything on one document so that I can print it out very easily or, failing that, (2) each individual application on one document which can be printed out."

"Refreshing memory via the extranet is not swift on-line. It isn't always clear where on the extranet information is stored; on occasion the ordering of documents is awkward; and the dual numbering (with 8-9 digits) of referee's reports (in three places, "combined", "late", "additional") makes it very slow to cross-reference. I can see the problem but couldn't we have a rational coding system instead of arbitrary numbers?"
16. Your Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HESA13/14</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Members Survey</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Your age range

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 29</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>up to 29</th>
<th>30 - 39</th>
<th>40 - 49</th>
<th>50 - 59</th>
<th>60 - 69</th>
<th>70 and over</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Your ethnic group

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HESA 13/14</strong></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Panel Member Survey</strong></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Do you consider yourself to have a disability according to the terms given in the Equality Act 2010?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you consider yourself to have a disability according to the terms given in the Equality Act 2010?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel Member Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Please indicate the type of impairment which applies to you.

- Physical/mobility impairment, such as a difficulty using your arms or mobility issues which require you to use a wheelchair or crutches
- Visual impairment, such as being blind or having a serious visual impairment
- Hearing impairment, such as being deaf or having a serious hearing impairment
- Mental health condition, such as depression or schizophrenia
- Learning disability/difficulty, such as Downs syndrome or dyslexia
- A cognitive impairment such as autistic spectrum disorder
- Long-standing illness or health condition, such as cancer, HIV, diabetes, chronic heart disease or epilepsy
- Other
- Prefer not to say