



NORTH PACIFIC RESEARCH BOARD

"Building a clear understanding of the North Pacific, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean ecosystems that enables effective management and sustainable use of marine resources."

1007 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 100 | Anchorage, AK 99501 | tel 907.644.6700, fax 907.644.6780

North Pacific Research Board Meeting Summary December 13, 2017 Meeting by Teleconference

The North Pacific Research Board met by teleconference on December 13, 2017. Board members attending: Dan Hull (Chair), Patrick Barelli, Forrest Bowers, Bill Britt, Dorothy Childers, John Gauvin, Becca Gisclair, Jan Jacobs, Heather Mann, Doug Mecum, Gerry Merrigan, Mike Miller, Tara Riemer (Vice-Chair), Cheryl Rosa, and Dee Williams. Absent: Brad Moran, Brad Smith. Also attending were Nagruk Harcharek, Vice-Chair of the Advisory Panel; and Betsy Baker, Matt Baker, Danielle Dickson, Jo-Ann Mellish, and Brendan Smith, who provided NPRB staff support.

1. Call to Order/Approve Agenda and Minutes

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:04 AM Alaska Time.

MOTION: A motion to approve the agenda was entered and passed with no objection.
ACTION: The motion passed with no objection.

MOTION: A motion to approve the minutes of the Nov. 27 meeting was entered and passed with no objection.

Discussion: A correction was requested to remove Chris Siddon from the list of Board members and retain him in the list of panel members attending.

ACTION: The minutes, with this correction, were approved with no objection.

A Board member noted that the November 27 meeting ended with a motion on the floor upon which the Board had not acted. The Chair explained that this meeting would begin with that motion on the floor and that two board members had recently proposed motions for consideration at today's meeting: a revised motion, and a substitute motion. Both proposed motions were then circulated by email to the Board.

2. Review of the postponed motion from the November 27 meeting

The motion on the floor at the end of the November 27 teleconference appears in the minutes from that meeting.

The motion was withdrawn by the Board member who proposed it. There was no objection to withdrawing the motion.

The Board member who withdrew the previous motion entered the following revised motion:

MOTION: The Board agrees that the status quo process for proposal submission to NPRB's Core Program is untenable because it provides limited time for preparing submissions, securing outside reviewers, and completing internal

reviews, and can result in reduced success rates for the number of proposals competing for limited funding.

In developing a new system, it is the Board's intent to maintain the historically broad distribution of funding across the types of research categories and approaches. The Board also intends to maintain access to research awards for the diversity of applicants that have historically participated in the annual Core Program funding process.

The preferred option for replacing the current system is a rolling submission approach, which has been shown to alleviate similar problems in other funding institutions. Input from the community of proposers may inform further deliberations by the Board in finalizing decisions regarding a new proposal submission process.

The maker of the motion explained that it expresses the intent to seek input from the community of proposers.

Common themes emerged during questions and discussion on the motion, including (with the mover's replies):

- How the language would be used: as guidance to staff
- How "preferred alternative" is understood: as reflecting previous Board decisions and not precluding a change of course if a sufficiently strong idea emerges.
- How input from the community of proposers would be used: to obtain input on rolling submissions and suggestions to improve the submissions process, including alternatives; to answer questions and seek community feedback in advance of finalizing any changes.

Amendment: A Board member entered an amendment to strike four words ("is untenable because it") from the motion's first paragraph.

Action: Amendment passed with no objection.

ACTION on Main Motion: The motion as amended passed with no objection.

As amended, the first paragraph of the motion reads as follows:

The Board agrees that the status quo process for proposal submission to NPRB's Core Program provides limited time for preparing submissions, securing outside reviewers, and completing internal reviews, and can result in reduced success rates for the number of proposals competing for limited funding;

the remaining two paragraphs of the motion remain the same.

During the preceding discussion, the proposer of the substitute motion accepted the language of the revised motion as amended and did not seek to introduce the substitute motion.

3. Staff presentation of Proposed Decision Points and Timeline

Staff described proposed decision points and a timeline for implementing rolling submissions, both of which were designed to address issues raised by Board members since the November 27

teleconference. Staff suggested that any implementation logistics be finalized in a face to face meeting. Staff proposed an extra day be added to the May 2018 Board meeting for discussion of the specifics of implementing the RS process, as informed by feedback received from the community of proposers. Staff presented the decision points and timeline for information only and was not seeking a Board vote on them.

A Board member asked that a draft RFP incorporating the rolling submissions approach be available for Board review in advance of the May 2018 meeting. Staff replied that such a draft RFP was provided in the Fall 2017 meeting materials as Appendix 7 and could be modified for the May 2018 Board meeting if the Board provided specific feedback.

The Chair invited a motion for guidance to staff on preparing for the 2018 AMSS.

A Board member entered the following motion, adapted from paragraph 2 of the substitute motion that was not introduced above (see last sentence of section 2, above).

MOTION: At AMSS, staff should organize a session that invites stakeholders and : 1) comprehensively outlines the problems facing our Core program (e.g. staff workload and efficiency, SP workload and efficiency of their work and time, reviewer burnout and difficulty getting quality reviews, other); 2) describes status quo program, describes rolling submissions as the preferred alternative to our process that we are considering in 2019, 3) solicits input on rolling submissions, and requests attendees provide other ideas they may have for fixes that address problems described in item 1.

Discussion. The Chair clarified, and the maker of the motion agreed, that the motion encompassed the following points for the AMSS session:

- Outlining the Board's decisions including its decision that rolling submissions is the preferred alternative for the 2019 RFP, and reasons why;
- Describing the structure of rolling submissions as developed so far;
- Noting a variety of decision points that the Board will be reviewing at its May 2018 meeting;
- Identifying alternatives that the Board and panels considered previously and have not pursued; and
- Asking for feedback from the community on what we are presenting and suggestions for alternatives they may have that we have not considered.

A Board member asked that staff track responses during and after the AMSS session to see if they correspond to type of institution or other observable patterns. Staff will report on such metrics at the May 2018 Board meeting.

Staff requested clarification on two points:

- When to announce the AMSS session; prior to, or at the AMSS.
- How to understand "the structure of rolling submissions as developed so far." The Chair and others indicated this could encompass items not pursued or finalized, including details on key logistics and additional attributes presented in the November staff memo.

The Chair suggested that the Executive Committee could take up the timing and content of the statement announcing the AMSS session.

ACTION: The motion passed with no objection.

4. Board Discussion and Voting on postponed motion and any subsequent motions

a) Postponed Motion and/or Statement of Intent

See discussion and vote under item 2 above.

b) Key logistics: Item 2 in Staff Memo, pp. 4-7

No further discussion beyond planning to take up key logistics at the May 2018 meeting.

c) Additional attributes: Item 3 in Staff Memo, pp. 7-8

No further discussion.

d) Roll-out procedure: Item 5 in Staff Memo, p. 11

In addition to the discussion under Agenda Item 3, above, staff clarified that an online portal will be used to solicit comments on rolling submissions and related matters after the AMSS information session.

MOTION: A motion was entered to adjourn.

ACTION: The motion passed with no objection and the meeting adjourned at 11:27 AM Alaska Time.