Highlights of Feedback from the 2010 HRP Investigators' Workshop

At the 2010 HRP Investigators' Workshop, feedback was requested from the attendees to help us evaluate the Program. The answers were collected, and highlights of the responses are given below.

Total Participants at Workshop: 472
Total Respondents to Survey: 105
Response Rate: 22%

Profile of Survey Respondents

Affiliation

- University: 44
- Contractor: 33
- Civil servant: 25
- Other: 3

Area / Role

- NASA Civil Servant: 3
- Researcher with NSBRI grant: 28
- Researcher with NASA grant: 23
- Researcher with NASA contractor: 18
- Contractor in Support Role to NASA: 10
- Flight Medicine: 1
- NASA Civil Servant/Management: 17

Length of Time in Role

- <1 year: 12
- 1-3 years: 34
- 4-8 years: 22
- >8 years: 38
Venue Evaluation

Feedback on HRP
2010 Workshop Compared to 2009 Workshop

- Feedback solicitation
- Location
- Days of the week
- Poster sessions
- Proportion of plenary sessions and panels
- Schedule

2009 BETTER
2010 BETTER
What did you like the best about the workshop?
- Networking (25 responses)
- Venue (19 responses)
- Food (17 responses)
- Plenary sessions (9 responses)
- Information presented (8 responses)
- Research talks on Thursday (4 responses)
- Very well organized (4 responses)
- Interesting and current information (3 responses)
- Panel sessions (3 responses)
- USRA staff / hospitality (2 responses)
- Better schedule (2 responses)
- Session on developing and implementing technology for market (2 responses)
- Opportunity to learn about a wide range of research projects (2 responses)
- Poster sessions (2 responses)
- Very good mixture between operations and research (2 responses)

What did you like the least about the workshop?
- Location / Commute (12 responses)
- Poster session time (3 responses)
- Schedule (4 responses)
- Discipline-specific scheduling (4 responses)
- Overlap of multiple concurrent sessions (3 responses).
- Speakers were not kept on time (5 responses)
- Would suggest spending a little more time on discipline-specific sessions and less on overview activities (such as HRP road map overview). (2 responses)

General comments/suggestions on the workshop?
- Incorporate "new talent" in major tracts.
- Need a way for cross-cutting areas in behaviors to intersect – BMed, sleep, team, HF.
- Have day 2 with poster session earlier, one or two less plenaries, split-up breakout sessions so one can attend talks outside discipline.
- Add evening session the day before the workshop to introduce new investigators to HRP personnel (e.g. Element/Project Scientists), HRP org, HRP processes (7 – 9 pm).
- Love the inclusion of students and young investigators. I would love to see this expanded to include travel awards.
- More focus on SBIR projects
- Provide adequate time for NSBRI team meetings.
- Availability of food and coffee enhanced interactions.
- Excellent facility.
- Great meeting.
Comments about HRP:

- Last NRA too limited in scope. All NRAs should include major areas (physiology, BHP, and radiation).
- I don't feel findings reach enough operational and astronaut personnel – they need to attend this meeting & perhaps a synopsis of this meeting (especially discipline session results) could be sent to all astronauts and key operational personnel.
- Quarterly prep and workshop prep can be very close together – maybe whatever quarter that falls within workshop time frame should be omitted – with workshop in its place that quarter.
- It is not always clear that NASA is making the best use of HRP research. Clear customer agreements and more defined requirements would help projects to be more responsive to the NASA at large.
- Reporting: depends on org needs, but all others do an annual report. However, quarterly is manageable.
- All research reports should be represented in the NASA SP. Also, there should be a directory of all peer-reviewed articles published.
- Compared to other government agencies, HRP is doing an outstanding job.
- Operational constraints: Although HRP is trying to communicate this, however, I am still not convinced that many extramural investigators really comprehend the constraints.
- Please continue to have researchers with operational experience continue to describe experiences and give suggestions to improve process.
- It is very nice to see the strong connection between HRP and NSBRI researchers.
- Provide excellent forum for HRP management and researchers.

List activities within HRP that you feel have been successful or add value to your work with NASA.

- Collaborations (11 responses)
- Networking (3 responses)
- Research (3 responses)
- Outreach (2 responses)
- Bedrest facility is very professional and vital to HRP research.
- Just about all the research work. Lots of really valuable and interesting projects.
- Exchange on even personal basis.
- Coordination with NASA management.
- Risk management process and board
- Space Architecture
- EVA systems
- There are many individuals who are great team players and try to disseminate information to the research community as the knowledge becomes available to them. This is great!
- I like the recent specific NRAs, makes it easier to know what NASA wants.
- NSBRI and its investigators.
- Team meetings with NASA advisors provide excellent opportunity to obtain requirements.
- Improved interactions and collaborations between NASA intra-mural and extra-mural scientists.
List activities within HRP that you feel have not been particularly successful and require attention.

- Mouse hind-limb suspension studies.
- Communication with and involving other disciplines / integrated studies (4 responses).
- I think education and outreach has been successful but should probably be emphasized more in the future based on the new agency direction.
- Recently, timely access to the parabolic flight research plane has been a problem.
- Deterministic modeling.
- More intersection BMed, team, sleep, HF.
- There should be much stronger emphasis on Habitability and Space Architecture for crew living and working environments. The panel was entitled Hab Design for Science, but any mention of science was limited to going EVA to pick up samples, Apollo-style. For a 180 day lunar surface mission, the crew will need IVA labs.
- Defining research priorities and backing these priorities with sufficient NRAs. Clearly there are budget constraints, but those should be openly addressed. The HRP could take a stronger stance in showing the NASA program that this entity is vital to the program at large. Rally your PIs and ask them for more white papers and similar actions for a larger collective voice.
- Some intramural NASA investigators.
- More collaborations with life support technology development groups.
- Sustained research funding.
- Use of knowledge from previous studies by making it available to all researchers.
- Accessibility of human data.

List improvements you feel HRP could implement to enhance its value to the research community or to NASA stakeholders such as the Constellation Program and Medical Operations.

- Team meetings other than at IWS.
- Newsletter
- Edited books
- Lay out a 4- 5 year plan and do your darnedest to stick to it! Research takes time. We need to feel more secure and be assured funding isn't going to be taken away at a whim. The HRP is the ONLY entity supporting both basic and applied space life science research. This comes with a HUGE responsibility to ensure each major risk is being given the attention it deserves. You have a big job. We appreciate much of the work you do, but more transparency would be appreciated and help us all to work better together.
- Names, phone number and emails of investigators in various HRP areas.
- Further enhance connections between JSC facility and researchers.
- I think there could be a better more formal relationship established with ETDP especially in the areas of life support systems, radiation protection, and sensor activities
- Expand research to cover some lower TRL (e.g. 2-7).
- Need standard research measurements in all crew and this data needs to be accessible.
- Should involve Medical Operations more (at least in this meeting). Only 1 (JD Polk) was at meeting. This would give an opportunity to further allow the clinical and research side to interact with each other.
- Keep up the excellent work.