

## **2012 Performance Review Panel Structure, Process and Timeline**

A key evaluation component of the Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) process is the Performance Review Panel (PRP). Once every four years, the PRP will carry out a retrospective evaluation of each Program's implementation of its strategic plan and the Program's overall impact on society. The first PRP will convene in October 2012 to assess each Program's progress towards its 2010-2013 strategic plan and the Program's 2008-2011 overall Program impact. Subsequent PRPs will take place two years after the completion of the Program's strategic plan and will provide an assessment of the Program's success in achieving its previous four-year plan.

The remainder of this document describes the constitution of the PRP, the materials to be used for the review and how the evaluation will occur. Appendix A contains a timeline for the 2012 PRP schedule.

### **I. Performance Review Panel (PRP) Composition**

The PRP will be appointed by the National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) Director. Members of the Sea Grant network are encouraged to provide nominations. The PRP will be comprised of approximately 30 individuals including members drawn from the National Sea Grant Advisory Board, academia, government, industry, and practitioners with expertise in appropriate fields.

### **II. PRP Materials**

#### **Reports from Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation Resources (PIER)**

In preparing for the PRP, Program focus area reports will be produced covering the period February, 2010 through January, 2012 using PIER (see an example of the focus area report in Appendix B). To assess a Program's progress towards its 2010-2013 Program strategic plan, the PRP will review impact and accomplishment statements that are linked to Program goals, and the Program's progress towards its performance measures and objectives. (This information comes from the Program's 2010 and 2011 annual reports.) To assess the Program's overall impact, the PRP will review the brief Program summary report, in addition to the other material.

#### **2010 Annual Reports**

Programs have already submitted 2010 annual reports (October, 2011). Subsequently, many Programs have requested that they be able to edit the impacts and accomplishments that were included as part of that report since the information was incomplete. The system will be opened for editing 2010 impact or accomplishment statements, and Programs will also have the ability to identify and flag any impacts or accomplishments that they do not want included in the report that is forwarded to the PRP. Directions on how to edit an impact or accomplishment statement can be found on the homepage of PIER (<https://pier.seagrant.noaa.gov>).

#### **PRP Program Summary Report**

Each Sea Grant Program will produce a Program summary report that is intended to capture major accomplishments and impact stories that occurred between 2008 and 2011 for each of their focus areas. To limit the burden on Programs and the PRP, the summary reports will be limited to a total of 20 pages for all focus areas combined (further guidance can be found in Appendix C).

### **III. Performance Review Panel (PRP) Structure and Role**

To facilitate the review, PRP members will be divided into four working groups according to their expertise. Each of those working groups will be responsible for reviewing the one of the national focus areas. Programs had the opportunity to include Program-specific focus areas in their strategic plans in addition to the national focus areas. Most of the Program-specific focus areas outside of the national focus areas were marine/coastal literacy. To be as consistent as possible with the concept of expert review, a fifth working group will be formed to review just the Program-specific marine/coastal literacy focus areas included in the Program strategic plans. The remaining few Program-specific focus areas will be assigned, in consultation with the Program, to the most appropriate national focus area working group for review.

The review timeline will be as follows:

Week 1 (October 15-19, 2012): Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (SSSS), Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD), and “Marine/Coastal Literacy” PRP working groups held

Week 2 (October 22-26): Finalize PRP reports from Week 1

Week 3 (October 29 – November 2): Hazard Resiliency in Coastal Communities (HRCC), and Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (HCE) PRP working groups held

Week 4 (November 5-9): Finalize PRP reports from Week 3

Each panelist will be assigned as either the primary or secondary reviewer for a subset of Programs, and will be responsible for filling out the evaluation form (see Appendix D) prior to the PRP review. All other members on the PRP focus team working group will serve as tertiary reviewers. The primary reviewer will be responsible for leading the discussion on each Program with substantive input from the secondary panelist, and will be responsible for the final summary report back to the Program. Each Program will be discussed in depth and all PRP members will be expected to provide a rating. The first four days are to discuss each Program individually, with the fifth day used to calibrate scoring and begin drafting the PRP reports. Each working group will have a facilitator.

If a PRP member has a conflict of interest with a particular Program, he or she will not take part in the discussion nor provide a rating for that Program. All reviewers will need to sign a conflict of interest form (CD-571).

#### **IV. PRP Ratings**

Ratings for the 2012 PRP will be determined in part based on the Programs’ progress towards meeting their own plans and in part by the overall impact of the Program during the 2008-2011 time period. Each of the two aspects of performance will be weighted equally.

##### Progress toward Plan

The PRP working groups will first assign a rating based on the Program’s progress towards its plan in the designated focus area. This rating is achieved by averaging the final scores of all PRP working group members based on the evaluation criteria (see Appendix D for the evaluation form). This rating will account for 50 percent of the Program’s score for a particular focus area. The rating scale for progress towards Program plan is as follows:

- a. *Highest Performance (4) – exceeds expectations by an exceptional margin in most areas/aspects*
- b. *Exceeds Expectations (3) – by a substantial margin in some areas/aspects*
- c. *Successful (2)*
- d. *Below Expectations (1)*
- e. *Unsuccessful (0)*

##### Overall Impact

After each of the five PRP working groups has finished the evaluation of Program performance relative to the Program plans, the working groups will then be asked to make an additional assessment of each Program’s overall impact within the focus area between 2008-2011 by considering the Program Summary Report along with the information already reviewed. This rating is achieved by averaging the final scores of all PRP working group members and will account for 50 percent of the Program’s score for a particular focus area. The rating scale for overall impact is as follows:

- a. *Highest Performance (4) –had particularly outstanding scientific or societal contributions on the local, regional or national level relative to their level of federal investment*
- b. *Successful (2) – had an acceptable, but not unusual, level of performance relative to the level of federal investment*
- c. *Below Expectations (0) –had a level of performance substantially less than what would be expected relative to the level of federal investment*

##### PRP Reporting

Once discussions are completed, the primary PRP reviewer for each Program will prepare a report that includes an explanation for the rating, the Program’s strengths and weaknesses, recommendations for improvement, and any best practices that should be noted.

## V. After the PRP

Upon completion of the review process, all PRP reports and evaluation forms will be sent from the National Sea Grant Director to the Sea Grant Program Director. The Sea Grant Program Director will have an opportunity to submit a memorandum to the National Sea Grant Office responding to the findings in the PRP reports.

### National Sea Grant Office Annual Review

The first NSGO annual review that follows the PRP evaluation will be expanded to include a performance assessment based upon the PRP working group ratings and the Program's response to those reviews. This review finalizes Program ratings and will be used to allocate merit funds.

### Overall Program Ratings and Allocation of Merit Funds

The PRP working group ratings for each focus area will be averaged and used to generate a weighted PRP rating for each Program. The weights are determined by the proportion of funding resources allocated by the Program to each of the National focus areas (Programs enter this "estimated level of effort" information annually into PIER). "Funding resources" includes all NOAA federal, matching and leveraged funds that are managed by the Sea Grant Program and used to meet the outcomes and objectives of the four-year plan. For example, if a Program allocated 10% of its resources to the Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD) focus area and was rated Highest Performance (4) for its progress toward meeting its plan and Successful (2) for its overall impact (average of 3), and 90% of its resources to Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (HCE) with a rating of Exceeds Expectations (3) for its progress toward meeting its plan and Successful (2) for its overall impact (average of 2.5), it would receive an overall weighted rating of 2.55, calculated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rcc} \text{SCD} & \text{HCE} & \text{Overall} \\ (10\% * 3) + (90\% * 2.5) & = & (0.3) + (2.25) = 2.55 \end{array}$$

Merit funding will be allocated based on the overall Program rating from the PRP review starting with the 2014 award. Rather than grouping Programs into a small number of rating categories and allocating the same merit funding to each Program within the category (as was done with the previous Program Assessment system), the allocation for each individual Program will be proportional to its overall rating.

Note: Any Program that is rated as "Unsuccessful" based on the Site Visit will not be eligible for merit funding.

## **Appendix A: 2012 PRP Timeline**

April 3, 2012:	2010 Annual Report corrections due into PIER
June 1, 2012:	2011 Annual Report due into PIER
August 17, 2012:	Program Summary Reports due into PIER
August 24, 2012:	Program Summary Reports sent to PRP members
October 2012:	PRP held <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Week 1 (October 15-19, 2012): Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply (SSSS), Sustainable Coastal Development (SCD), and “Marine/Coastal Literacy” PRP working groups held</li><li>• Week 2 (October 22-26): Finalize PRP reports from Week 1</li><li>• Week 3 (October 29 – November 2<sup>nd</sup>): Hazard Resiliency in Coastal Communities (HRCC), and Healthy Coastal Ecosystems (HCE) PRP working groups held</li><li>• Week 4 (November 5-9): Finalize PRP reports from Week 3</li></ul>
December 10, 2012:	PRP reports sent to the Programs
January 25, 2013:	Optional Program Response Memos regarding the PRP review reports due into the NSGO
Jan. 28-Feb. 8, 2013:	NSGO Review (a review of the PRP reports and the Program responses)
April 1, 2013:	Final NSGO reports with ratings sent to Programs (allowing Programs to factor in budget implications prior to the selection of their proposals for the 2014-15 cycle)

## Appendix B: PRP Report Outline

(A report is needed for each PRP working group: HCE, SSSS, SCD, HRCC, and “Marine/Coastal Literacy”. Below is an outline of the report that will be produced out of the PIER database system, using the Healthy Coastal Ecosystem (HCE) as an example. This report outline will be replicated for each focus area.)

### Focus Area - HCE

*HCE section of the Program plan*

#### **I. Program’s Progress towards Plan (2010 – 2011)**

(List of Program goals followed by the impact and accomplishment titles that are aligned to that goal)

For example,

**PROGRAM GOAL: Methodologies are developed and used to evaluate ecosystem-based management approaches and guide future management efforts.**

#### **Impacts**

**TITLE:** Sea Grant Contributes to Development of Standardized Multi-State Spawning Census for Horseshoe Crabs

Relevance, Response and Results:

Recap:

#### **Accomplishments**

**Title:**

Relevance, Response and Results:

Recap:

(All impact titles that connect to HCE “Goal 1” will continue to be listed here, then the system would pull the next goal and the list of impact titles that are connected to HCE “Goal 2”).

#### **HCE Program Performance Measures (2010 – 2011)**

Program Performance Measures	Program Plan Target (2010-2013)	Actual (2010 & 2011)	Anticipated (2012)	Program Comments

#### **HCE Program Objectives (2010 – 2011)**

Program Objective	On Target/Not on Target	Achieved (yes/no)	Program Comments

## Appendix C: Brief Program Summary Report Guidelines

Program summary reports will be reviewed by the Performance Review Panel in conjunction with a “progress towards plan” focus area report (generated by the PIER database). In order to ensure a fair and equitable review that focuses on content, Program summary reports should have the same look and feel. **Program Summary Reports that do not conform to the guidance below will not be presented to the Program Review Panel.** Program summary reports will be due into PIER no later than **August 17, 2012.**

**Format:** Programs should write a brief Program summary report for each of their focus areas. The total number of pages for all brief Program summary reports cannot exceed 20 total pages for all focus areas combined, but it is up to the discretion of the Program how many pages are allocated to each focus area. Any white space due to starting a new section of the report document will not be counted towards the 20 page limit. The font size should be no less than 10 and should be Times New Roman. Margins should be no less than 0.5 inch. Figures and illustrations may be included. All reports will be uploaded into PIER in PDF format and printed by the National Sea Grant Office.

**Content:** The brief Program summary reports should reflect the Program’s overall impact in a particular focus area and highlight major accomplishments and impacts that occurred between 2008 and 2011. How the information is presented within the report is up to the Program’s discretion. For example, Programs may want to explain how a series of projects were necessary over time to accomplish an objective or to achieve an outcome greater than the “sum of the parts”. This will be the PRP’s only source of information for impacts that occurred in FY2008 and 2009. For impacts that occurred in FY2010 and 2011, the PRP will already have reviewed the impact statements, so there is opportunity either to present additional information or to highlight areas where the Program has been particularly effective.

## Appendix D: PRP Evaluation Form

**NOTE:** In evaluating the Program's progress toward implementing their approved strategic plan (from the PRP Report), the baseline rating should be a 2, which may change based on the materials presented. Please use only the ratings indicated below (integers 0-4).

### a. **Progress Toward Plan**

*Please circle the rating:*    **4**   **3**   **2**   **1**   **0**

1. *Highest Performance (4) – exceeds expectations by an exceptional margin in most areas/aspects*
2. *Exceeds Expectations (3) – by a substantial margin in some areas/aspects*
3. *Successful (2)*
4. *Below Expectations (1)*
5. *Unsuccessful (0)*

1. **Is the Program making significant progress towards their previously approved Program Goals, Program Performance Measures, and/or Program Objectives in this focus area? Please describe the evidence below.**

## Appendix D: PRP Evaluation Form (cont.)

**NOTE:** In evaluating the Program's overall impact, the baseline rating should be a 2, which may change based on the materials presented. Please use only the ratings indicated below (integers 0, 2, 4).

### b. Overall Impact

*Please circle the rating:*    4   2   0

1. *Highest Performance (4) – particularly outstanding scientific or societal contributions on the local, regional or national level relative to their level of Sea Grant federal investment*
2. *Successful (2) – an acceptable, but not unusual, level of performance relative to their level of Sea Grant federal investment*
3. *Below Expectations (0) – a level of performance substantially less what would be expected relative to their level of Sea Grant federal investment*

**1. Considering the level of Sea Grant federal investment, is the Program making a significant contribution to science and technology in this focus area? Please describe the evidence below.**

**Suggested Considerations for Panelists –**

- What are the contributions to science and engineering: 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 federal investment?

**2. Considering the level of Sea Grant federal investment, is the Program making a significant contribution to society beyond the contribution to science and technology in this focus area? Please describe the evidence below.**

**Suggested Considerations for Panelists –**

- What are the economic benefits (e.g., value, jobs, and businesses) claimed?
  - New or expanded industries, companies, businesses?
  - Cost savings/ productivity improvements?
- What are the social benefits claimed?
  - Improved management of resources?
  - Better-informed public/constituent group on a major issue?
  - Changes in constituent group/public opinions/behavior?
  - Better public health/safety?
- What is the area of impact: Local/State? Regional/National? International?
- What has been Sea Grant's role in producing this benefit?