

FINAL

**NOAA Science Advisory Board  
Teleconference Meeting  
December 22, 2010  
11:00AM-12:00 PM**

Presentations for this meeting will be posted on the SAB website at

<http://www.sab.noaa.gov/Meetings/meetings.html>

Attendees

SAB members in attendance: Mr. Raymond Ban, Chair and Consultant, Weather Industry and Government Partnerships, The Weather Channel; Dr. Eric Barron, President, Florida State University; Dr. Heidi Cullen, CEO, Climate Central; Dr. Frank Kudrna, Kudrna and Associates; Dr. Eve Gruntfest, Director, Social Science Woven into Meteorology, University of Oklahoma; and Dr. Jerry Schubel, President and CEO, Aquarium of the Pacific.

NOAA senior management and Line Office representatives in attendance: Dr. Paul Sandifer, Senior Science Advisor; Mr. Craig McLean, Acting Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research; Dr. Michael Uhart, Executive Director for Laboratories and Cooperative Institutes, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research; Dr. John Cortinas, NOAA Cooperative Institutes Program.

External participants in attendance: Dr. G. Allen Burton, Director, Cooperative Institute for Limnology and Ecosystem Research

Staff for the Science Advisory Board in attendance: Dr. Cynthia J. Decker, Executive Director; Mary Anne Whitcomb.

**Consideration of the Report from the External Review of the Cooperative Institute for Limnology and Ecosystem Research, University of Michigan**

Ray Ban, SAB Chair, welcomed members and other attendees and introduced the agenda item for the teleconference: consideration of the report from the external review of the Cooperative Institute for Limnology and Ecosystem Research (CILER). The goals of the meeting included a review of what took place regarding the CILER Review at the last meeting, review of the revised language in the Review Team Report, and consideration of points to be included in the transmittal letter to NOAA.

Jerry Schubel reminded the Board members that at the November SAB meeting there were questions related to the review committee ranking of Satisfactory and to the committee's wording of its final recommendation. At the November meeting, some members thought the

## *FINAL*

ranking should have been below satisfactory and had discussed the need for revised language, which was provided during the SAB meeting. Since the November meeting, Allen Burton, CILER Director, provided documentation that the University of Michigan is living up to its financial commitments; this documentation was provided to the SAB members prior to the teleconference. The review committee still believes the rating of Satisfactory is appropriate. It is clear to the committee that NOAA did not live up to its commitment to CILER; members heard this statement from Dr. Marie Colton, the new Director of the NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory (GLERL), the primary NOAA partner with CILER, at the November meeting. Dr. Schubel agreed that Satisfactory is the right ranking; he and the review committee believe it is a “new day” for CILER and GLERL and now it is time for both organizations to show their renewed commitment to the cooperative institute. The situation at GLERL was particularly bad so the review committee believed that NOAA had a responsibility in some of the shortcomings in that partnership.

Frank Kudrna asked about the modification of the University of Michigan position to CILER. Jerry Schubel responded that Allen Burton provided documentation showing that the University of Michigan did provide its required funding to CILER so that was not as much of an issue as the SAB believed at the November meeting.

Jerry Schubel added that Jim Sanchirico provided some additional wording for the SAB to consider in the letter transmitting the final report. The only changes in the review report document from the prior version provided at the SAB meeting are in the very last paragraph that follows the ranking. This new language covers the concerns raised by the SAB at the November meeting.

Ray Ban asked Allen Burton to summarize his letter provided to the SAB. Dr. Burton said the budget for CILER had been very confusing and there were mistakes made on the contract; this confusion occurred at both NOAA and the University of Michigan. CILER staff told the review team that the University of Michigan wasn't meeting its financial commitments. However, when the half of the Director's salary was included, it became apparent the University of Michigan did provide the required \$120K. Dr. Burton agreed that there are still shortfalls in Task 1 as identified by NOAA but this will be addressed. CILER will also add some additional funding for an outreach director at 50% as the report is recommending.

Ray Ban asked Jerry Schubel for clarification on the issue of NOAA's support of GLERL. Dr. Schubel said the issue was not so much about financial support as it was about a lack of oversight by NOAA of GLERL and of a collaborative relationship between GLERL and CILER. There was a clear failure of leadership in GLERL to embrace CILER and other partners in the Great Lakes.

Ray Ban noted that Jerry Schubel had mentioned Jim Sanchirico, who was not able to attend the teleconference, had provided the SAB with some thoughts and asked Dr. Schubel to expand on

*FINAL*

this topic. Jerry Schubel responded that in the letter transmitting the review report to NOAA, Jim Sanchirico suggested emphasizing the importance of requiring a clear financial commitment to CILER by the University of Michigan. Dr. Schubel recommended that in the transmittal letter to NOAA, the SAB emphasize that Cooperative Institutes are partnerships that rely on commitment of both universities and NOAA and that CILER needs a recommitment by both the University of Michigan and NOAA.

Paul Sandifer asked Jerry Schubel if it is still his intent that there be follow-up between NOAA and UM at some higher level than GLERL to ensure that this partnership is on a good footing for the future. Jerry responded that if the recommitment is recommended for both NOAA and the University of Michigan, he agrees this would be a good idea. Paul Sandifer suggested that this wording would be a useful addition to the transmittal letter.

Ray Ban restated that he heard no SAB member express any further concern about the recommended rating of Satisfactory or CILER as a result of the review. The members agreed there should be emphasis in the transmittal letter on the reaffirmation of commitment from the University of Michigan and all of the partners, including NOAA. This should be stressed as necessary to all successful Cooperative Institutes as well as specifically for CILER.

Ray Ban noted that the next steps are to accept the review and then to discuss wording for the transmittal letter. Eric Barron asked Jerry Schubel if the reason why NOAA was not cooperating with CILER was related to cooperation on the research side or if NOAA saw less value in working with CILER. In other words, was this issue related to administration or to scientists not cooperating on the research? Jerry Schubel responded that in this case, it was the failure of GLERL leadership and oversight, not a problem with the value of research, that there was a lot of willingness to collaborate on the part of scientists at both GLERL and CILER.

Frank Kudrna agreed with the observation that the problem was not with the perceived value of collaborative research. He noted that there were problems in the past with the GLERL leadership but now that there is a new Director, the situation is improving. It might be appropriate in the transmittal letter to mention that efforts are being made to improve GLERL's relationship with CILER in the future.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised CILER review report. Ray Ban asked for any further discussion and there was none. The motion was passed unanimously.

Ray Ban then asked about wording for the transmittal letter. He noted that the wording had been suggested on the need for documented high-level commitment on part of University of Michigan as well as commitment from all of partners. This kind of commitment is necessary for the successful operation of all Cooperative Institutes, but specifically for CILER, in this instance.

Frank Kudrna asked for specific reference to GLERL in the commitment - not criticizing current leadership in GLERL, but recognizing the need to take steps to resolve past issues.

## *FINAL*

Heidi Cullen asked what happens with the review and the rating of Satisfactory in terms of a future outcome. John Cortinas responded that as a result of the reviews, NOAA has to make a determination as to whether NOAA will offer another award for five years to the current institute at the current level of funding, at reduced level, or whether NOAA will close the institute. The wording of the rating is very important in making these decisions. Right now NOAA is preparing a response to the SAB review of the Northern Gulf Institute. Any actions taken as a result of the SAB review are shared with the SAB in this response.

Jerry Schubel said reviews are five-year retrospective reviews and the challenge with CILER was the changes in leadership that took place over that time.

Ray Ban said the next step is to draft the transmittal letter that captures the points identified today and circulate to the SAB members for review and comment. When the transmittal letter is finalized, the SAB will transmit the report to NOAA.

The SAB office will work with the Board on the transmittal letter and send it to members for review.

Craig McLean thanked the SAB members for their time and the insight and benefits of their observations. He stated that the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research is committed to follow through on the recommendations from the review because the Great Lakes are important to NOAA.

Ray Ban thanked Jerry Schubel and the entire review team for their efforts. This was not an easy process and he also appreciated the effort in the follow-up and additional detailed work done by the review team. Jerry Schubel said it was a good team and a good cooperative institute.

Cynthia said there are two more Cooperative Institutes coming up for review in 2011—The Cooperative Institute for Alaska Research (CIFAR) in July, and the Cooperative Institute for Climate Science in Princeton (CICS-P) in October. NOAA will be requesting that SAB members chair these reviews. More information will be provided to members when it is available. Heidi Cullen expressed interest in the CICS review at Princeton.

Ray Ban asked for the deadline for member commitment for chairing a review. John Cortinas said a request will be sent from OAR to the SAB to conduct the CIFAR review soon. It is important to have the chair engaged with the CI several months before the review for planning purposes.

Ray Ban said there will be a regularly scheduled SAB teleconference in January; for the Spring SAB meeting, NOAA is looking at dates in March.

Cynthia Decker reported that she is working with NOAA Administrator, Dr. Lubchenco and Deputy Undersecretary, Mary Glackin on these dates. The date of January 31 is likely for the January teleconference; March 9-10 and 15-16 are the dates currently being considered for the

*FINAL*

March meeting. More information on the dates for this meeting will be sent to the SAB members soon.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

Ray Ban adjourned the meeting and wished everyone a happy holiday season.