Research Steering Committee formation, function, future

Dr. Rachel Feeney, staff

RSC meeting August 8, 2018



Outline

(Documents #5a-5d)

RSC formation and evolution

Current considerations

• 2018 Council program review



Tuckman's Stages of Small-Group Development

- I. Forming. Setting goals, defining scope of tasks, team members are positive, excited, and polite – though roles are uncertain.
- 2. Storming. The weight of completing the task hits, disagreements may arise.
- **3. Norming.** Strengths are appreciated, group gets into a groove, procedures set up.
- 4. Performing. Driving full-speed towards goals.
- **5. Adjourning/mourning.** Goals have been accomplished, team disbands.



1999-2002 --- Forming and Storming

- \$\$\$ for collaborative research was on the rise (Northeast Consortium, Cooperative Research Partners Initiative, groundfish disaster assistance).
- Congress directed NMFS to work with NEFMC on designing a research program and developing priorities.
- NEFMC formed the RSC:
 - Active collaboration with NMFS on program design, priorities, proposal evaluation.
 - Early input and proposal review for Scallop Research Set-Aside program.
 - Clarified roles: NEFMC/RSC to steer/advise, NMFS to administer.
 - MANY meetings!



2003-2005 --- Norming

- As early projects were completed, NEFMC staff were receiving a lot of reports and requests to use results in management.
- RSC developed/revised its Research Review Policy:
 - Standards for what could be used in management,
 - What a sufficient technical review is, and
 - RSC process for conducting management reviews.
- RSC was regularly doing management reviews and giving input to CRPP.



2006-2015 --- Performing

- RSC "churned out" many management reviews of selected projects.
- Gave input on research priorities to NCRPP and for NEFMC-funded RFP. Deferred to SSC on the 5-year priorities.
- Gave input to NCRPP on budget use and strategic planning. Less input after the shift in 2011 to funding networks of researchers.
- A few revisions to the Research Review Policy.
- Staff turnover after 2011.
- Membership was declining in last few years.



2016-2018 --- Performing (back to storming?)

- Membership was reinvigorated.
 - Fully populated, same stratification of stakeholders.
 - NEFSC appointee no longer from Cooperative Research.
- RSC met three times:
 - Was asked for input on 5-year priorities, but gave input on process.
 - Management reviews of all Council-funded and selected RSA projects.
 - Updates from Cooperative Research; recommended that the network approach be evaluated.
- Considering future directions.



Current considerations

- Waning collaborative research funds
 - RSA and national programs still active (e.g., BREP, S-K).
 - NEC and NEFSC/CRP not issuing RFPs.
 - Fewer funding program staff to support information transfer to management.
- Priority setting
 - Less demand for input on RFP priority setting.
 - NEFSC priority setting becoming more integrated across center, center-wide collaborations.
 - RSA priorities now set by species PDT and committee.
 - RSC gave little input on 5-year and CRP priorities when given opportunity.
- Management reviews
 - More laborious to identify projects for review (status, documents).
 - RSC consensus statements generally say, "Valuable project! Council should consider using it!" Is this adding sufficient value?



2018 Council Program Review

- RSC praised as a constructive forum for bringing scientists, fishermen, and managers together.
- Effectiveness of the Research Review Policy in guiding Council actions is unclear.
- Role of RSC in research priority setting is unclear.
- Should the primary purpose shift towards setting priorities? If so, membership may need to shift.
- Clarify purpose, roles and tasks of the RSC.
- Review the research priority setting process of other Councils. Collaborate with regional partners.
- Map out the roles of each agency/subsidiary in research planning/prioritization to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency.

