

2015 Performance Review Panel (PRP) Guidance for Panelists

Performance Review Panel (PRP) Overview

Performance Review Panels (PRPs) will perform structured performance reviews of each Sea Grant programs' implementation of their 2010-2013 strategic plans. Each PRP will assess and rate the scientific preeminence and societal impact of each Sea Grant program relative to the federal Sea Grant investment in one focus area:

- Healthy Coastal Ecosystems,
- Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply,
- Sustainable Coastal Development,
- Hazard Resilience in Coastal Communities, and
- Ocean and Coastal Literacy.

Each panelist will provide a rating for each program (except in cases of conflicts of interest). Panelists shall recuse themselves from discussions for any program in which they have a vested interest, currently reside in that state (except for federal employees), or any other conflict of interest real or perceived.

Ratings will be used to determine funding allocation decisions for FY 2018-2021. Panelists will have about six weeks to review written materials on each Program's efforts. Each panelist will be the primary reviewer for approximately five programs and secondary reviewer for approximately 10 programs. Panelists are expected to provide ratings and written comments for assigned primary and secondary programs in advance of the panel meeting using the PRP Evaluation Form (Appendix A).

Panelists will meet over two conference calls, then meet as a in person for one full week in October 2015 in Silver Spring, MD (Appendix B). The National Sea Grant Office will pay for the panelists' travel, accommodations, and provide an honorarium (if permitted). After the review, the names of the panelists will be released without identifying focus area or primary reviewer assignments.

Before the Panel

1. Review the following program materials:

- a. Program introduction (one page)
- b. Approved Program 2010-2013 Strategic Plan
- c. Program Focus Area Report from Sea Grant's PIER database:
 - i. Impacts and accomplishments listed by the Program's goals
 - ii. Program objectives
 - iii. Program performance measures
- d. Program Summary Report- brief program impact summary written by the Program
- e. Sea Grant appropriated federal funds and required match associated with the topical area

2. Participate in a Conference Call:

- a. Introductions
- b. Discussion of the PRP process, including overview materials (e.g., guidance, forms, timeline)
- c. Responsibilities of primary, secondary, and tertiary reviewers
- d. Discuss of travel arrangements
- e. Review agenda for PRP
- f. Address any questions or concerns
- g. Finalize travel arrangements

3. Complete a written evaluation form (Appendix A) for approximately 15 programs and review documents for all other programs

- a. Each panelist will serve as:
 - i. a primary reviewer for approximately five programs
 - ii. a secondary reviewer for approximately ten programs
 - iii. a tertiary reviewer for all remaining programs
- b. The primary and secondary written evaluations will consist of rating and commenting on the scientific preeminence and societal impact of the Sea Grant program relative to the federal Sea Grant investments (Appendix B).
- c. These evaluation forms will be due to the working group chair prior to panel meetings:
 - i. SSSS, SCD and “Ocean Literacy” – Due October 16th
 - ii. HCE and HRCC – Due October 23rd
- d. The evaluation forms will be posted on a secure site so that other panelists can review them before the panel meets.

4. Prepare to discuss and rate ALL programs

During the Panel Meeting

1. Primary Reviewer –

- a. Provide overview of the program’s priorities and approach
- b. Explain ratings and comments
- c. Complete PRP Summary Evaluation Form by the end of the week-long review

2. Secondary Reviewer- Explain ratings and any additional comments

3. Tertiary Reviewer (all other panelists) - Explain ratings and any additional comments

4. Provide Feedback

- a. PRP Process
- b. Highlight exemplary program materials

5. National Sea Grant College Program Stories and Opportunities

- a. NSGCP strengths and gaps/opportunities (SWOT?)
 - i. What stories we should be telling (E.g., Research to Operations/Commercialization)?

- ii. What types of activities span multiple programs (e.g., Citizen Science)?
- iii. Where are we falling short?
- iv. What should we do next?

After the Review

- 1. Panelists may be asked clarifying questions following the review.
- 2. All panelists will be asked to share their thoughts about the PRP process.