



# **A Proposal For New Cooperative Institutes Review Process and Review Criteria under NAO 216-107**

**Philip L. Hoffman**  
Chair  
NOAA Research Council  
Cooperative Institute Committee

18 November 2014



# Survey Results Guiding the Plan



- Make sure Chair is well briefed
- Provide Chair and Panel with guidance on review 2wks prior to 1<sup>st</sup> telecon
- Provide firm deadlines/due dates to CIs for materials
- Mesh Admin Review into CI larger CI Review
- Increase time available for stakeholder, student, staff interaction with committee (possibly eliminating poster sessions)
- Provide greater context for each CI to open review



# Review Focus Areas

- The CI's Science Plan
  - CI vision,
  - CI goals and objectives,
  - CI metrics for progress,
  - Partnerships & Leveraging
  - CI Plan for capacity building
- Science Accomplishments
  - Publications/Bibliometrics
  - Science and technologies transferred to applications/operations
  - National and international leadership
  - Relevance to NOAA strategic, policy, or R&D documents and priorities
  - Social, economic, and/or environmental outcomes
  - Awards/recognition
- Science Management (includes business practices from Admin review);
  - Strategy for new starts, including Risk Assessment/Tolerance
  - Mechanisms for resource distribution, financial health
  - Demographics of employees, HR development & training,
  - Issues with NOAA processes & Requirements,
  - Issues with University processes and requirements Incl. Processes for ensuring Scientific Integrity
- Education/Outreach
  - Robust Outreach/Education Plan
  - Evidence of Leveraging
  - Demonstrated understanding of Stakeholder needs
  - Demonstrated Successes



# Ends of a Spectrum

## Primarily Quantitative

- Provide Likert Scale scores (5 pt scale) for each element in each focus area:
  - 1 “Not Competent”
  - 2 “Somewhat Competent”
  - 3 “Uncertain”
  - 4 “Competent”
  - 5 “Highly Competent”
- Total score computed for each Focus Area (sum of element scores)
- Grand Total Score is sum of all Focus Areas
- Grand Total Score Referenced to 4 categories

## Primarily Qualitative

- Focus Areas and Criteria remain the same.
- Score can be assigned to each Focus Area by the Committee (1-100)
- 1 page narrative added to each Focus Area to contextualize score (Show Your Work)
- No Grand Total



# Developing a Renewal Recommendation



## **Quantitative**

Review Recommendation from SAB relies on scoring with additional text to clarify and offer direction for CI to address in the second award period.

## **Qualitative**

Review Recommendation primarily narrative, using scores to delineate successful Focus areas from areas of opportunity or challenge.



# Example Scores

- Quantitative:
  - Science Plan (20/25)
  - Science Accomplishments (26/30)
  - Science Management (15/25)
  - Education & Outreach (20/20)
- Total 81/100;
- “Significantly Accomplished”
- Qualitative:
  - Science Plan (50%)
  - Science Accomplishments (95%)
  - Science Management (80%)
  - Education and Outreach (80%)
- “The CI functions exceptionally well at delivering requested science and translating it to usable products.”



# Quantitative CI Review Ratings



## Review Panel provides overall rating:

**Outstanding(86-100):** The CI has consistently demonstrated **superior achievement** of all initially agreed goals, as well as **evidence of leveraging that enhances NOAA's resources** to support collaborative research.

**Significantly Accomplished (70-85):** The CI makes **significant progress** in some of the Focus Areas and Criteria, but the review panel sees **missed opportunities** in other areas

**Satisfactory(55-69):** CI has achieved most of its agreed goals and has **demonstrated acceptable performance**. Its performance, however, is not considered outstanding and/or the university's resource commitment provides **limited leveraging of NOAA's resources**. Panel recommendations shall be applied to any new award through Special Award Conditions.

**Unsatisfactory(22-54):** CI has demonstrated a **failure to achieve** some or all of its agreed goals and its **performance is unacceptable** and/or the CI has also provided **minimal resources to enhance NOAA's resources** to conduct collaborative research. Panel recommendations shall be applied to any new award through Special Award Conditions.



# Straw schedule

- **Day 1 – Science Management, Planning and Partnering**
  - CI 101 (History of CI, NOAA context for current version, incl. management structure, relation to other campus academic and program units, non-NOAA leveraged research resources)
  - University Audit findings & Federal funds management practices
  - Stakeholder listening sessions
  - NOAA sponsor listening sessions
  - Writing time
- **Day 2**
  - Presentation of significant science accomplishments
  - Meet and greets with Grad students, post docs, and early career scientists
  - CI management listening session
  - Facilities tours (including off site/on water/ in lab presentations)
  - Writing time
- **Day 3**
  - Education and outreach day
    - Project/activity demonstrations
    - Stakeholder listening sessions
    - Resource leveraging
  - Writing time
  - Initial feedback to CI and NOAA





# Current Review Chair Prep



- Request Review Chair from SAB 6 mos. Prior to review, based on Research Themes @ CI under review.
- Receive SAB selection
- Set initial Telecon w/Chair, CI Program Director, NOAA Review Coordinator to discuss roles, responsibilities, documents and communications
- Provide Chair with recommended review panel members chosen from CI and NOAA submitted lists.
- Set Telecons with Review Panel, Chair and CIP once panel agrees to serve
- Provide Chair and panel review materials as developed by CI (usually electronically)



# Next Steps

- Completed surveys to CI Directors, CI Review Panel Chairs and CI Administrators have been reviewed to incorporate into proposal
- Incorporate SAB feedback and direction (complete 1 Dec)
- Present final plan to CI Committee for vetting and approval.
- Present Committee Approved plan to R/C for Approval (January 2015).
- Revise Handbook and issue new guidance to CIs (February 2015)



# Backup Slides





# CI Review Policy

- NOAA Cooperative Institute Policy ([NAO 216-207](#); September 2005)
  - 3.12 The decision to renew the CI will be based on the outcome of an extensive **peer review** near the beginning of the fourth year, to be conducted under the auspices of the **NOAA Science Advisory Board**. This review will include a **measurement of CI performance** relative to well-established, mutually agreed-upon performance measures defined by NOAA and the research institution. NOAA will use the peer review to determine the renewal period (1-5 years) and the level of funding commensurate with the final review rating. Annual performance also will be evaluated by the responsible LO using the same performance measures. These performance measures will be incorporated into the award as an additional term and condition.
- CI Policy handbook (written and maintained by CI Committee to implement NAO)
  - [Handbook updated November 2012](#)
  - Chapter 5 focuses on reviews and will need to be amended to reflect any changes recommended by the SAB and approved by the R/C.
- Consistent with Strengthening Science NAO (216-115)
  - Sec. 2.01 E: Be planned, monitored, **evaluated (including regular peer review)**, and reported on a regular and consistent basis to ensure that the Nation obtains a sustained return on its investment pursuant to NOAA's strategic goals and objectives;
  - Sec. 4.09 C: Expert review will be used for evaluations and will **include experts in relevant science (independent peer reviews)** and service (for portfolio reviews) fields.
  - Sec 4.09 D: To the extent practicable, consistent evaluation procedures will be used for both internal and external R&D activities.



# CI Review Process: Responsibilities



NOAA Research Council (R/C): Approves review guidelines and recommendations for renewal and provides general oversight of the CI program

R/C CI Committee: Ensures compliance with the CI NAO and Handbook, proposes major procedures pertaining to NOAA management of CIs and policy implementation. Maintains and approves CI Handbook amendments.

Responsible NOAA Line Office: manages CI award and reviews

CI Director: Oversees all NOAA-funded CI activities, including submission of proposals and reports, reviews, and management by responsible Line Office

SAB: Conducts the reviews for the CI program, including approvals for science reviewers, and advises NOAA Leadership on findings and recommendations.



# CI Review Outcomes to date



- No CIs rated Unsatisfactory and thus terminated.
- 1 CI rated Satisfactory – significant number of individual Special Award Conditions with University President/NOAA Administrator meeting
- Remaining CIs rated Outstanding
- New NOAA Task I policy developed and implemented
- New NOAA CI program communications plan developed; not yet implemented fully.