

# **GLERL Science Review**

March 22-24, 2016

## **Final Pre-Review Team Conference Call**

Friday, March 11, 2 - 3 pm EST

Dial-In **866-916-3537** participant code **6879456**

# Roll Call for March Conference Call

## Review Panel Members

- **Dale J. Hoff** (*EPA*), *Chair*
- **Dorothy Hall** (*University of Maryland*)
- **Thomas O'Reilly** (*MBARI*)
- **Robert Weller** (*WHOI*)
- **Robert Sterner** (*University of Minnesota - Duluth*)
- **Russell Kreis** (*EPA*)
- **Ram Yerubandi** (*Environment Canada*)
- **Kenneth Rose** (*Louisiana State University*)

# Participating in Call from OAR

- **Steven Fine** – OAR Deputy Assistant Administrator
- **Philip Hoffman** – OAR HQ coordinator
- **Deborah Lee** – GLERL Director
- **Margaret Lansing** – GLERL Review Coordinator
- **Laura Newcomb** – OAR HQ staff
- **Laura Newlin** - GLERL Management Support Assistant
- **Mary Anne Whitcomb** – OAR HQ staff

# Outline for this Call

- Recap of the purpose for the review
- Recap of actions from the February 17 Teleconference
- Recap of Charge to Reviewers (evaluation criteria, ratings, report timeline)
- Coverage of research themes by reviewers
- Reviewer evaluation forms
- Suggested outline of the Review Report
- Stakeholder session
- Review website
- Latest review agenda
- Travel and laboratory logistics
- Questions

# Purpose of Review

- Laboratory science reviews are conducted about every 5 years. GLERL's last review was conducted in 2010. For GLERL, the review period is 2010-present.
- Evaluate quality, relevance, and performance of research to both internal and external interests
- Strategically position laboratory in its planning of future science
- Intended to ensure research is linked to NOAA strategic plan, mission, and priorities. Preliminary documentation has been posted on the review website: <http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016>
- Sole purpose of planning and executing the review is to support review team in reaching their conclusions.

# Actions from the February 17 Teleconference

Action	Status
Post GLERL and NOAA Goals Matrix: Diagram of how GLERL work (branch goals) relates to the guiding documents of NOAA Goals on review website: <a href="http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016/guiding_docs/GoalsMatrix.pdf">http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016/guiding_docs/GoalsMatrix.pdf</a>	Completed-on review website
Overview of the budget and a budget breakdown by three research themes. GLERL will also provide information on core vs. proposal-driven funding.	Will be provided at the review
List of publications, awards, service, technology transfer, partnerships from the last 5 years. Includes and H index and web of science highly cited	Completed-on review website
Report from 2010 review and actions taken in response—Note this is already on the GLERL review website <a href="http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016/reviewer_documents.html">http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016/reviewer_documents.html</a>	Completed - on review website

# Charge to Reviewers

(Refer to [GLERL Review Panel Guide](#))

## Three focus areas:

**Quality**: Assess quality of research over the last 5 years, and whether appropriate approaches are in place to ensure high quality work will be performed in the future.

**Relevance**: Assess the degree to which research and development is relevant to NOAA's mission and of value to the Nation.

**Performance**: Assess the overall effectiveness with which the laboratory plans and conducts its research and development.

## Charge to Reviewers *(cont.)*

- Each reviewer is asked to independently prepare written evaluations (see Evaluation Worksheets in the *Review Panel Guide*).
- While each reviewer does not have to complete an evaluation for all review areas, the review panel should coordinate assignments so that each research area has at least two evaluations.
- Each evaluation, per research area, should include an overall rating of “Highest Performance,” Exceeds Expectations,” “Satisfactory,” or “Needs Improvement.”
- The criteria for these ratings are in the *Review Panel Guide* document and on the Evaluation Worksheets.
- In addition to the overall ratings for each research area, if possible also assign one of these ratings for the subcategories of Quality, Relevance, and Performance within the research area reviewed.
- Please identify the specific areas for improvement for a rating of “Needs Improvement.”

## Charge to Reviewers *(cont.)*

- The Chair, Dr. Dale Hoff, will prepare a draft summary report of the individual evaluations but will not do a consensus review.
  - The Chair will summarize the individual reviewer evaluations to develop a list of actionable recommendations
  - The Chair will submit the draft summary report as well as the individual reports to Philip Hoffman, OAR HQ coordinator within **45 days** of the review.
- In the individual and draft summary reports, we would appreciate your feedback on the review process, including any sessions or information that could have been omitted without impacting the quality of your review. We will use this feedback to refine our review process and reduce any unnecessary review preparation for the laboratories.

## Charge to Reviewers *(cont.)*

- Within **30 days** of the draft summary report submission to the OAR HQ Coordinator, OAR will provide any technical clarifications to the review team.
- Within **30 days** of receiving OAR comments on the draft report, Dr. Dale Hoff is asked to provide the final summary report and any updated individual evaluations to the OAR Assistant Administrator, Craig McLean, with a copy to Philip Hoffman.

# Scope of Review

## Research Areas:

- Ecosystem Dynamics
- Integrated Physical and Ecological Modeling and Forecasting
- Observing Systems and Advanced Technology

# Reviewer Evaluation Forms

- The *Reviewer Evaluation Worksheets* are provided in the *Review Panel Guide*. The *Guide* and *Evaluation Worksheets* are available on the review website.
- Other review panels have found it helpful to enter the assessments in the expandable text boxes provided in the *Review Panel Guide* WORD document.
- Please also consider filling out the *Reviewer Feedback Worksheet* (also in the *Review Panel Guide*) with additional comments and feedback about the review process.

# Suggested Outline of Review Report

- ✓ **Cover Page** -- Please include a title page with the title, *Summary Report of the Review of the NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory*, the date of the review, and the names of the reviewers and their organizational affiliations.
- ✓ **Overview Section**-- Please include details of the location and date of review and the research areas covered in the report. Please include a statement that the report is not a consensus, but a summary of individual reviewer reports.
- ✓ **Summary of Laboratory-Wide Findings and Recommendations**-- Include in this section an overall findings and recommendations relevant to the entire Laboratory. Also include a listing/table that summarizes each reviewer's overall evaluation rating (Highest Performance, Exceeds Expectations, Satisfactory, Needs improvement) for each research area he/she reviewed, and, if possible, also ratings for the subcategories of Quality, Relevance, and Performance. It is helpful for the Laboratory to understand the findings and recommendations, if the recommendations are worded so they are actionable.

# Suggested Outline of Review Report *(cont.)*

- ✓ **Findings and Recommendations by Research Area**-- Include findings and recommendations for each research area, and include the overall rating for each research area (Highest Performance, Exceeds Expectations, Satisfactory, Needs Improvement). For ratings of “Needs Improvement” please suggest specific actions the Laboratory could take to make improvements.
- ✓ **Summary of Recommendations**-- Please include a numbered list of all recommendations in your report.

A recent review report can be provided as an example of the format.

# Stakeholder Session

- Stakeholder responses to the questions are being provided to the review panel prior to the review.
- The schedule with the order for the stakeholder session is included in the agenda. There are two concurrent sessions of stakeholders so we ask the reviewers to split attendance between the two groups.
- OAR Headquarters staff will be present to keep time and place calls to stakeholders participating by phone.

## Discussion on Website

- The review website can be found at:

<http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016>

- This is a public website that will be used by all review attendees.
- The website includes sections on science presentations for the review as well as supporting and guiding documents.
- The review panel's final summary report and the lab's responses to the recommendations, will be posted on this website when available.

Are there any questions on the materials already on the website?  
Are there any other materials not on the website that you would like to see?

# Latest Agenda

- The latest agenda for the review is posted on the website: <http://www.glerl.noaa.gov/review2016>

Questions about the agenda?

# Travel Logistics

- Travel arrangements have been completed. Any additional questions should be sent to the GLERL travel point of contact:

Barb Gerych, [Barbara.Gerych@noaa.gov](mailto:Barbara.Gerych@noaa.gov) 734-741-2394

- Transportation options from the airport and directions to the hotel are on the review website
- Transportation from the hotel to GLERL by shuttle
- Review Panel should be ready to leave the hotel at 8 am each morning
- GLERL staff will expedite your check in
- For logistics purposes, we ask you provide Barbara Gerych with your cell phone number.

# Review Logistics

## Meals

- Tuesday Breakfast: Review Panel has breakfast with OAR leadership at the Kensington Court Hotel at 7 AM in the Library. The breakfast buffet will be served in Graham's restaurant and can be taken across the hall to the Library
- Lunches will be provided at a cost of \$15 per person each day. You will be reimbursed for meals at the government per diem rate, so no receipts are needed for meals.
- Tuesday Dinner will be at Sava's for Review Panel and OAR and GLERL senior staff only
- Wednesday Dinner at Arbor Brewing Company is optional for all attendees

## Laptops

- GLERL has a guest wifi network (no password needed)
- No outside thumb drives or other storage devices are allowed in the building. GLERL can provide thumb drives, if necessary.
- A big screen will be available in the small conference room dedicated for Review Panel closed working sessions. Please email Margaret Lansing at [margaret.lansing@noaa.gov](mailto:margaret.lansing@noaa.gov) for details regarding connectivity to the screen.

Are there any questions about travel or review logistics?

## Questions?

- In addition to this teleconference, your questions on the review can be discussed with Craig McLean and Gary Matlock at breakfast on March 22 at 7:00 AM in the Kensington Court hotel and anytime during the review.
- You can also contact Philip Hoffman at [philip.hoffman@noaa.gov](mailto:philip.hoffman@noaa.gov) for non-travel questions on the review.

*Thank You*

**Questions?**