

# **2012 Transitional Performance Review Panel (PRP) Guidance for Panelists**

## **Performance Review Panel (PRP) Overview**

- Panelists will perform a structured performance review of 31 Sea Grant programs in a specific focus area for the years 2008 through 2011.
- Panelists will be split into five working groups (Healthy Coastal Ecosystems, Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply, Sustainable Coastal Development, Hazard Resiliency in Coastal Communities, and Ocean and Coastal Literacy).
- Working groups will review: (1) each program's progress towards achieving its four-year strategic plan (for the years 2010-2011), and (2) each program's overall impact (2008-2011) in that focus area.
- Each panelist will provide ratings on both the program's progress towards their plan and the program's overall societal impact in that working group (ratings will be used in funding allocation decisions for the next four years).
- Panelists will have about six weeks to review written materials on each Program's efforts.
- Panelists will provide ratings and written comments for assigned primary and secondary programs (approximately 15 programs) in advance of the panel meeting, participate in two conference calls (mid-July and late August), then meet as a panel for one full week in October/November, 2012 in Silver Spring, MD (Appendix A).
- Each panelist will be the primary reviewer for approximately five programs and is responsible for completing the PRP Summary Evaluation Form by the end of the week.
- 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.
- 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.

## **Before the Panel meets**

The review preparation will entail:

### **1. Review Program Materials:**

- a. 2010-2011 PRP Report (focusing on the program's progress towards plan):
  - i. Impacts and accomplishments listed by the Program's goals
  - ii. Program objectives
  - iii. Program performance measures
- b. Program Summary Report (2008-2011):

- i. A brief Program impact summary written by the Program
- c. Reference Materials:
  - i. Approved Program Strategic Plan
  - ii. Optional one-page introduction
  - iii. Sea Grant Federal Investment in the focus area

**2. Participate in Conference Calls** (there will be two calls):

- a. One in late July
  - i. Introduction to the Focus Area working group
  - ii. Discussion of the PRP process, including overview materials (2012 Transitional Performance Review Panel Guidance, forms, timeline)
  - iii. Responsibilities of primary, secondary, and tertiary reviewers (assigned prior to call)
  - iv. Discuss of travel arrangements
- b. One in late August
  - i. Review agenda for PRP
  - ii. Address any questions or concerns
  - iii. Finalize travel arrangements

**3. Complete a written evaluation form (Appendix B) 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 in two areas (Appendix B):
  - i. progress towards plan
  - ii. overall impact
- c. These evaluation forms will be due to the working group chair prior to panel meetings:
  - i. SSSS, SCD and “Ocean Literacy” – Due October 1<sup>st</sup>
  - ii. HCE and HRCC – Due October 15<sup>th</sup>
- 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. Begin discussion of assigned programs
  - b. Explain two ratings and comments:
    - i. Program progress towards plan

- ii. Program overall impact
- c. Complete PRP Summary Evaluation Form by the end of the week-long review and submitted electronically to the Chair of the working group.

2. **Secondary Reviewer-**

- a. Explain two ratings and any additional comments:
  - i. Program progress towards plan
  - ii. Program overall impact
- b. Provide additional comments for the PRP Summary Evaluation Form

3. **Tertiary Reviewer – (all panelists that are not a primary or secondary reviewer)**

- a. Provide two ratings and any additional comments:
  - i. Program progress towards plan
  - ii. Program overall impact
- b. Provide additional comments for the PRP Summary Evaluation Form

**After the Review**

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

Please don't hesitate to contact your PRP Chair with any questions:

*Healthy Coastal Ecosystems* - Dorn Carlson - [Dorn.Carlson@noaa.gov](mailto:Dorn.Carlson@noaa.gov)

*Safe and Sustainable Seafood Supply* - Gene Kim - [Gene.Kim@noaa.gov](mailto:Gene.Kim@noaa.gov)

*Sustainable Coastal Development* - Mike Liffmann - [Michael.Liffmann@noaa.gov](mailto:Michael.Liffmann@noaa.gov)

*Hazard Resilient Coastal Communities* - Joshua Brown - [Joshua.Brown@noaa.gov](mailto:Joshua.Brown@noaa.gov)

*Ocean and Coastal Literacy* - Chelsea Berg - [Chelsea.Berg@noaa.gov](mailto:Chelsea.Berg@noaa.gov)

## Appendix A: Panelist Timeline

<u>Week of</u>	<u>Event/Task</u>
July 23, 2012	First conference call
August 20, 2012	Materials sent to panelists
August 27, 2012	Second conference call
*October 1, 2012	Week 1 (SSSS, SCD, Literacy) primary and secondary panelist evaluation forms returned to panel chair via Google Docs or email.
October 15, 2012	Week 1 (SSSS, SCD, Literacy) working groups meet in Silver Spring, MD. Panelists provide rating and comments on Program progress toward plan and overall impact. Primary panelists complete PRP Summary Evaluation Form.
*October 15, 2012	Week 2 (HCE, HRCC) primary and secondary panelist evaluation forms returned to panel chair via Google Docs or email.
October 29, 2012	Week 2 (HCE, HRCC) working groups meet in Silver Spring, MD. Panelists provide rating and comments on Program progress toward plan and overall impact. 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.**

## Appendix B: 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).

### I. Progress Toward Plan

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

- 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)*
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 B: 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).

### II. Overall Impact

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

- a. *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*
- b. *Successful (2) – an acceptable, but not unusual, level of performance relative to their level of Sea Grant federal investment*
- c. *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?