

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, 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 two Conference Calls:

- a. August
 - i. Introductions
 - ii. Discussion of the PRP process, including overview materials (e.g., guidance, forms, timeline)
 - iii. Responsibilities of primary, secondary, and tertiary reviewers
 - iv. Discuss of travel arrangements
- b. September
 - i. Review agenda for PRP
 - ii. Address any questions or concerns
 - iii. 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 12th
 - ii. HCE and HRCC – Due October 19th
- 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

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.

2015 Sea Grant Performance Review Panel Evaluation Form

Ratings for the 2015 PRP will be based on the program's scientific preeminence and overall impact on society relative to appropriated Sea Grant federal investment as guided by its strategic plan. Consider the approved program strategic plan and the investments of Sea Grant appropriated resources, and please provide a rating based on the impacts, accomplishments, objectives, and performance measures reported in the PIER Focus Area Report and the Program Summary Report.

* Required

Reviewer Name: *

Sea Grant Program *

Focus Area *

- Hazard Resilient Coastal Communities
- Healthy Coastal Ecosystems
- Marine/Coastal Literacy
- Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply
- Sustainable Coastal Development

Program rating based on contributions to science and society as described in the strategic plan: *

- 1.0 - Highest Performance – exceeds expectations by an exceptional margin in most areas
- 1.5
- 2.0 - Exceeds Expectations by a substantial margin in some areas/aspects
- 2.5
- 3.0 - Meets Expectations in most areas/aspects
- 3.5
- 4.0 - Below Expectations in some areas/aspect
- 4.5
- 5.0 - Unsuccessful in most areas/aspects

Is the program making a significant contribution to society through advancements in science and technology in this focus area?

Suggested Considerations for Evaluators – What are the contributions (e.g., seminal publications or patents) to science and technology: new understanding, products, processes, and technology? What is the area of impact: Local/State? Regional/National? International? What has been Sea Grant’s role in producing this contribution? Are the science and technology contributions commensurate with the size of the program?

Is the program making a significant contribution to society beyond the contribution to science and technology in this focus area?

Suggested Considerations for Evaluators – What are the societal benefits of the program? Are the public or constituent groups better informed on a major issue? Has public health or safety improved? Have there been changes in constituent group or public opinions or behavior? What are the economic benefits (e.g., value, jobs, businesses) of the program? Are there new or expanded industries, companies, businesses? Are there cost savings or productivity improvements? Has the management of natural resources improved as a result of the program’s efforts? What is the area of impact: Local/State? Regional/National? International? What has been Sea Grant’s role in producing this benefit?

Submit

Never submit passwords through Google Forms.

Powered by

This form was created inside of National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

[Report Abuse](#) - [Terms of Service](#) - [Additional Terms](#)

Appendix B: Panelist Timeline

<u>Week of</u>	<u>Event/Task</u>
August, 2015	First conference call
August 24, 2015	Materials sent to panelists
September, 2015	Second conference call
*October 12, 2015	Week 1 (SSSS, SCD and “Ocean Literacy”) primary and secondary panelist evaluation forms returned to panel chair via Google Docs or email.
October 19, 2015	Week 1 (SSSS, SCD and “Ocean Literacy”) working groups meet in Silver Spring, MD. Panelists provide ratings and comments. Primary panelists complete PRP Summary Evaluation Form.
*October 19, 2015	Week 2 (HCE and HRCC) primary and secondary panelist evaluation forms returned to panel chair via Google Docs or email.
October 26, 2015	Week 2 (HCE and HRCC) working groups meet in Silver Spring, MD. Panelists provide ratings and comments. Primary panelists complete PRP Summary Evaluation Form.

*** Actual due date (a Monday) for the evaluation forms. Please don’t wait until Friday of the week indicated.**