National Sea Grant Advisory Board Assessment of Sea Grant's Planning, Implementation and Evaluation Process Report September 2013

I. Introduction

Charge to the National Sea Grant Advisory Board

The National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) Director charged the National Sea Grant Advisory Board (NSGAB) to assess the lessons-learned from the 2010-13 Planning, Implementation and Evaluation (PIE) cycle. Capitalizing on the completion of this first cycle of the PIE process, the NSGAB should base recommended revisions for the 2014-17 cycle by reviewing what worked well and what did not from the 2010-13 cycle.

The NSGAB developed a subcommittee (PIE Assessment Committee) with membership from the Advisory Board, Sea Grant Directors and the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO).

This committee reviewed all PIE guidance and informational documents, which included feedback from the Performance Review Panels and Site Visit panelists, the Sea Grant Network, and a Sea Grant Association survey on the entire PIE process. When reviewing materials and making any recommendations, the committee ensured that the PIE process met standing legislative requirements:

- National Network should have a strategic plan (Legislation – 1123D2a)
- All programs must have a four year plan that establishes priorities for the National Sea Grant College Program (Legislation – 1123C1)
- All programs must implement their plans (Legislation – 1126D1)
- All programs must be evaluated (Legislation – 1123D3a)
- Every two years – the NSGAB is to report to Congress on the progress made toward meeting the priorities identified in the National Network plan (Legislation – 1128B2)

Overarching Findings

After several weeks of document reviews and conference calls, followed by an in-person meeting, the committee agreed with the following as overall guidance for their PIE assessment:

> The Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation (PIE) process has a good structure and meets the recommendations from the 2006 National Research Council Report, *Evaluation of the Sea Grant Program Review Process*. The first cycle was largely successful; however, it was too big and costly. The committee also found that all the components of the evaluation process were not well integrated into an overall assessment of the individual Sea Grant programs (programs) or the Sea Grant network.

II. Findings and Recommendations

Below are recommendations to improve the efficiency of the current PIE process without compromising the ability to evaluate programs and the overall Sea Grant network.

PLANNING

Findings

The National Sea Grant College Program (NSGCP) has a rigorous and thorough planning process at both the National and program level. Currently, planning at the National and program level happens simultaneously, with programs needing to ensure their plans align with the National Network plan. This simultaneous timing of the plans can be confusing and require significant additional work to ensure this alignment.

In the current planning process, programs are required to request permission from the National Sea Grant Office (NSGO) to make changes to their strategic plans. This requires time and effort from both the program and the NSGO for minor changes (i.e., changes in personnel and funding), and is inefficient.

Recommendation P-1: The NSCGP should continue initiating a broad National Network Strategic plan based on National Ocean Policy and NOAA top-down mission requirements. Once this national plan is complete, the programs will then develop their own plans based on this broad national strategic plan. The individual program will receive approval of their strategic plan from the NSGO.

Recommendation P-2: Minor changes in program plans do not need to be approved by the NSGO. Adjusting performance measure targets should be *strongly* discouraged. Programs should contact the NSGO for proposed changes to their individual plans to address only *significant* emerging or unexpected issues (e.g., Hurricane Sandy, Gulf Oil Spill, or irradiation of a new aquatic invasive species).

IMPLEMENTATION

Findings

Implementation happens at different levels within the National Sea Grant Program. At the National level, activities are organized into focus areas. Focus areas are managed by focus teams.

The original expectations of these Focus Teams were to:

1. Facilitate planning, implementation, synthesis and reporting of Sea Grant activities and accomplishments;
2. Identify new opportunities and directions for Sea Grant national and regional initiatives;
3. Catalyze cooperative efforts among Sea Grant programs, the NSGO, NOAA, other agencies and stakeholder organizations, and NGO's; and
4. Provide a mechanism to further solidify Sea Grant's local, regional, and national identity.

These tasks are important and should be continued. Currently, for various reasons (including budget constraints) these tasks are not being fully met. The focus teams are large (64 members) and

geographically dispersed. Focus Team contributions to the Sea Grant mission have been limited with most of the participation done by the Sea Grant Fellows and Focus Team Chairs and Vice-Chairs. Our committee recognizes that these Sea Grant mission tasks should reside within the NSGO, but the NSGO currently lacks the capacity to address all four expectations.

Recommendation I-1: The NSGCP Director should find more efficient ways to accomplish each of the four tasks currently given to the large focus teams. Examples of Teams that could perform these tasks could include:

- An external panel,
- Smaller, more narrowly directed Focus Teams,
- A NSGAB subcommittee, or
- NSGO staff (redirected from other efforts).

EVALUATION

Findings

The current evaluation process of the individual Sea Grant programs includes annual reports from the programs, an annual NSGO review, a program site visit, and performance review panels. During the annual review, the NSGO reviews the programs' annual reports, site visit reports, and performance review panel findings and any programs' responses. The site visits review the performance of the programs in three areas: 1) program management and organization, 2) stakeholder engagement, and 3) collaborative network/NOAA activities. The performance review panels evaluate the results (impacts, accomplishments and success of reaching performance measures) of the programs. The site visits and performance review panels are conducted once during the four-year evaluation cycle. These evaluation processes are compartmentalized and not fully integrated into the overall evaluation of the program.

Recommendation E-1: Integrate annual reviews, site visits, and an external evaluation panel into an overall four-year evaluation process.

Annual Reports

Findings

The committee finds the annual report a necessary part of the PIE process, and an important part of the program evaluation. On an annual basis, programs submit a report to the NSGO. These annual reports include impacts and accomplishments, and progress towards performance measures and metrics. All annual report information is currently submitted by the programs into a database known as PIER (Planning, Implementation and Evaluation Resource). Thus, the PIER outputs assume a much higher priority than simply tracking database input. Annual Reports can track progress; however, they should not be the only source of data for the overall program evaluation process.

The annual report serves as an 'annual review of programs' and also serves as a performance progress report for the purpose of grant renewal.

Recommendation E-2: Continue on-going, joint, NSGO/SGA efforts to improve NSGO annual reporting guidance, particularly the definitions of performance measures and metrics.

Recommendation E-3: The format of the PIER outputs should be improved to enhance usability across the various reporting and performance evaluation needs across the network.

Annual Review Process

Findings

The annual review conducted by the NSGO is an important process to assess each program on an annual basis. This is an opportunity for the programs to work closely with the NSGO program officer to demonstrate annual results through their annual report. The NSGO also includes the site visit report, the performance review panels' findings and ratings, and program responses in the year the annual review is conducted. However, the results of these NSGO reviews are not included in the four-year evaluation process that affects merit funding. There are portions of the NSGO annual review process that are closed to the programs.

Recommendation E-4: We encourage constructive feedback between the NSGO program officer and the Sea Grant program to assure continued improvement and cooperation. The committee feels this is an important step to improve the annual review process which should be included as input to the four-year evaluation. The role of the program officer should be that of a liaison (honest-broker), communicating with programs.

Recommendation E-5: The results of the annual reviews should be included in the program's four-year evaluation process.

Recommendation E-6: The program Director should be invited to all segments of the NSGO annual reviews for their program.

Site Visits

Findings

The site visit proved to be a valuable part of Sea Grant program assessment. The site visit team meets with the program management team, advisory committees, and university administration to review and discuss broad issues related to 1) program management and organization, 2) stakeholder engagement; and 3) partnerships with the Sea Grant Network and NOAA. There is network consensus on the success of the site visits; however, the site visit reports have not been adequately integrated into the overall four-year evaluation process.

Recommendation E-7: The site visit report should be included as an influential input to the program's four-year evaluation.

Recommendation E-8: With inclusion of the site visit reports in the four-year evaluation process, there should be new training and guidance developed, for the NSGAB, the NSGO and individual programs, on how the site visit will be used in the evaluation process.

Performance Review Panel

Findings

The current performance review panels (PRPs) assess the impacts of the program by focus area. The simultaneous performance review of all programs by the same panelists allow for consistent rating within panels. However, due to the amount of material provided by the programs, the review was very labor intensive. The impacts were not prioritized by the programs, which made it difficult for the reviewers to evaluate their relative importance in their program goals. Separating program results into focus areas assessed by separate PRPs was perceived as inhibiting a consistent scoring across the four focus areas. An analysis of the performance review scoring however showed no significant difference between panels.

The impacts across focus areas for the individual programs and the network were lost by separating the program results by focus areas.

Recommendation E-9: The committee recommends the PRP be replaced with the external evaluation panel.

Recommendation E-10: The committee supports the concept of all programs being evaluated simultaneously every four years by a 'National Sea Grant External Evaluation Panel' to evaluate each individual program in the following categories:

Program Director's Impact Report	50%
Site Review Team (SRT) Report	35%
Annual Review Summary	15%

- The external evaluation panel should be comprised of members from the NSGAB, NOAA, other State/Federal Agency Officials, and leaders from academia/industry.

- The NSGCP Director, in consultation with the NSGAB and Sea Grant Directors, shall develop guidance for producing the three documents as well as evaluation/rating criteria to be used by the external evaluation panel.

- Limitations should be set on the volume of material presented to the National Sea Grant External Evaluation Panel:
    - Program Director's Impact Report should not exceed 15 pages.
        - Directors should explain how their program accomplished their individual Sea Grant program plans.
    - The SRT Report should not exceed 10 pages.
    - The NSGO program officer Annual Review Summary:
        - A brief presentation, and
        - Annual review summary memorandums (should not exceed 6 pages).

Recommendation E-11: The External Evaluation Panel will give each program a rating, which should be used by the NSGCP Director to determine merit funds.

Timing of the External Evaluation Panel

Finding: The committee recognizes there are two guiding principles in a conceptual review framework:

1. A Sea Grant program should be evaluated based on its success over a full four-year strategic planning window.
2. A Sea Grant director needs to be informed about his/her projected funding level prior to planning for the next four-year Omnibus program.

Due to time restraints, it is impossible for a full review of a four-year Omnibus (strategic plan cycle) to occur immediately following a cycle and a determination of base/merit funding by the NSGCP Director prior to beginning of the next four-year cycle. It is more important for a program Director to know future funding levels for research, outreach and education work plan development, than to have an exclusive review of only a specific strategic plan window.

Recommendation E-12: The committee feels that a mid-cycle review (year three) is the best option to allow proper time for the previous cycle's research accomplishments to become impacts and External Evaluation Panel results to be synthesized by the start of the next cycle. Site visits should occur in years one and two.

III. General Recommendation

The NSGAB PIE Assessment committee recommends, with implementation of any or all of the NSGAB recommendations contained in this report, the NSGCP Director coordinate evaluation guidance with the Sea Grant Directors and the National Sea Grant Advisory Board.

NSGAB PIE Assessment Committee

NSGAB

Dick West - Chair
Dale Baker
Amber Mace
Bill Stubblefield

NSGO

Sami Grimes - co-Chair
Chris Hayes

SGA

Sylvain DeGuise, CT Program Director
Jim Hurley, WI Program Director