



## UNIVERSITY-NATIONAL OCEANOGRAPHIC LABORATORY SYSTEM

Moss Landing Marine Laboratories 8272 Moss Landing Road, Moss Landing, CA 95039

(831)-771-4410 Fax (831) 632-4413 www.unols.org office@unols.org

**Date:** July 10, 2007

**To:** UNOLS Council, UNOLS Representatives and Supporting Federal Agencies

**From:** Mike Prince, UNOLS Executive Secretary

**Subj:** Competition for next UNOLS Executive Secretary and UNOLS Office host institution.

1. The attached request for input on the process for selecting an Executive Secretary and host institution was circulated on June 25<sup>th</sup> to all UNOLS institution voting representatives, Council members, Standing committee members and key Federal agency representatives.
2. Responses have been received from the following people to date:
  - a. John Diebold – LDEO – Council member
  - b. Doug Hammond – USC – UNOLS Rep
  - c. Larry Atkinson – ODU – UNOLS Rep
  - d. Doug Ricketts – U. Minn LLO - RVOC, RVTEC, SSC member
  - e. Bob Houtman – ONR – Facilities program manager
  - f. Wilf Gardner – TAMU – UNOLS Rep
  - g. Albert Hine – USF – FIC member
  - h. Mary-Lynn Dickson – URI – RVTEC
  - i. Dave Hebert – URI – FIC Chair, Council
  - j. Joe Ustach – Duke – Ship Scheduler, RVTEC
  - k. Nancy Rabalais – LUMCON – UNOLS Rep
  - l. Bob Knox – SIO – UNOLS Rep
  - m. Stan Winslow - UHawaii (RVOC, Ship Scheduler) & Brian Taylor – UH (UNOLS Rep)
  - n. Bob Detrick – WHOI – UNOLS Rep
  - o. Russ McDuff – UW – UNOLS Rep
3. I have collated the responses organized according to the three key questions as follows:
  - a. Five-year increments: Should the charter be changed to reflect five-year terms with an opportunity for competition or re-competition every five years?
    - If 5 years with a formal re-compete is NSF policy, that's what we should do, no matter how painful. (Diebold)
    - I think five-year terms would be good, for reasons you articulated. (Hammond)
    - Five seems better than three anyway. Allows time for true evaluation. (Atkinson)
    - 5 years seems reasonable for the reasons you outlined in your email. (Ricketts)
    - ONR would support a 5-year (renewable once) award for the hosting institution. (Houtman)
    - Five years makes more sense to fit with the NSF reviewing process. The only question is whether or not there is an adequate method to get a new office on track or removed if you find after a couple of years they are not doing the job. I



would assume that NSF would provide pretty rapid feedback if there are issues that need correcting. (Gardner)

- I vote for 5 years to bring the rotation into synch with NSF. (Hine)
- Yes, five year terms instead of three years. Makes much more sense to be in sync with the funding cycle of the federal agencies. (Dickson)
- I think that the terms should be adjusted to the NSF cycle of 5 years with a maximum of two terms at a specific institution. (Hebert)
- Five years instead of three - YES. This change would give the office three to four years to concentrate on UNOLS things and not have to put in time every two to three years getting stuff ready for review. (Ustach)
- I think a five year term is much better than a three year term, and it should coincide as closely as possible to NSF activities. (Rabalais)
- Five years seems sensible in order to mesh with agency timelines and cycles. (Knox)
- Length of each term should be five years. Three years is not enough time to gain and utilize the experience you need to do this job. (Winslow & Taylor)
- Given the logistics involved in establishing an office, recruiting personnel etc. I believe a 5-year term makes more sense than a 3 year term. It is also more consistent with NSF's review and re-competition of co-operative agreements. (Detrick)

b. Limit on tenure at one institution: Should the charter be changed to allow an institution to compete for a second term with a limit of ten years total, except under extraordinary circumstances? Or, should we just provide for competition every five years and let the competition determine the ultimate length of an institution's tenure?

- This would, as you mention, require a 10-year max span, not 9. But with the 5-year re-competition in place, a 10-year max would not be too much. (Diebold)
- With the five-year terms, 2 of them should be good. I think competition should be allowed, although if the council, with NSF input, wanted to do a review in the 3rd or 4th year of term 1 to consider the option of renewal without competition, this would also be a good system. If there was a perceived problem on the part of the council, NSF, or the designated institution, then they could open it up, and if not, they could opt to just continue the status quo for five more years. (Hammond)
- I recommend a real review prior to the 5th year. If all is ok proceed with a second term. (Atkinson)



- I would give an opportunity for one renewal, unless another institution voices a desire to compete for the honor after the first term of the current institution. In that case, have a competition. Two terms (10 years) is enough time at one institution. (Ricketts)
- ONR would support a 5-year (renewable once) award for the hosting institution. This once renewable award seems simpler and less apt to have problems. With a longer award, we can imagine an issue of control by the member institutions and their support or lack of support for the host's procedures. To allay these fears, perhaps a clause could be inserted which would allow a change in location after a vote of no confidence. (Houtman)
- Is there presently NO review after 3 or 6 years? I know we did a review of the office two years ago, but I guess that was to satisfy the NSF requirement of reviews every 5 years. NSF will require a review after 5 years in the future. It seems that it should be allowed to have someone compete for it after 5 years if they thought they could do a better job. I don't get the sense that the UNOLS office is a responsibility that lots of institutions are clamoring to take on because they realize how much work and commitment it requires and are grateful that someone else is willing to do it. Larger institutions may be more anxious to take it on than I realize. I think that 10 consecutive years is probably long enough for any institution to host the office - unless there are extraordinary circumstances - such as no one else will step forward and the present institution is willing to continue hosting. I assume you are not suggesting that an institution couldn't ever have it more than once. (Gardner)
- I am a believer in corporate memory so I would vote for a review after one 5 yr term just to keep people on their toes. But, allow them one more term if they did not make a mess of things in the 1st term. If the review is satisfactory, then a 2nd term is automatically granted. If there is great unhappiness, then there should be a competition for a new venue. (Hine)
- Suggest a maximum of two 5-year terms. Competition only when it is time to move to a new institution. Second term would be a renewal that is contingent on good performance/review of the first term. Also, I suggest keeping the current model of the UNOLS Office and the east coast office/sub-office. This has worked very well, especially when the UNOLS Office is located on the west coast. (Dickson)
- I think that the terms should be adjusted to the NSF cycle of 5 years with a maximum of two terms at a specific institution. (Hebert)
- If the term length gets changed to five years, then there should be a two term limit - we're almost at that point now. I do think there should be a review after the first term but not necessarily a competition. There should be a mechanism, however, to replace the institution/office if the review is a negative one. (Ustach)



- I do not think that there should be a total tenure allowable. If a hosting institution is doing a good job, there should not be a forced move. However, the ability to compete every 5 years should be an option. (Rabalais)
  - If the federal procedures press toward or even require a review or recompetition at 5 years, so be it, but I think that a second 5-year term should definitely be allowable. I would hope that the practical result, if not the formally codified outcome, would be that a second 5-year term would be "normal" if (i) desired by the host institution, and (ii) performance in the first term had been satisfactory. If a formal recompetition is not required at the 5-year point, perhaps Council could institute a review at, say, 4 years with an eye toward continuing the host inst. beyond the 5-year point, barring the emergence of any fundamentally adverse review information to the contrary. A 10-year/2-term total limit seems reasonable. (Knox)
  - Total tenure should be limited to two, five year terms. UNOLS Council should have the option to re compete after the first five year term after considering input from NSF and ONR plus interest expressed by any other institution to host the UNOLS Office. (Winslow & Taylor)
  - I favor a limit of one renewal (i.e. 2 five year terms) for the location of the office at any one institution. It is healthy for the UNOLS community for the office to rotate. If the performance of the office is "satisfactory" during the 1st 5 years, the expectation would be renewal for a second 5 year term. The question is how you assess "satisfactory" performance. The problem here is twofold. One whether Council is the right body to make this decision, and second if they chose to re-compete it really would be an indictment of the host institution and thus something Council might be really reluctant to do even if the performance of the host institution had been less than satisfactory. I favor a real re-competition after 5 years regardless of the performance of the host institution. If the host institution has done an exemplary job for the past five years, I have no doubt they will fair well in such a competition. (Detrick)
- c. Non-operator Host Institution: Should UNOLS open competition up to all UNOLS institutions to host the UNOLS Office?
- By all means, non-operator institutions should be included. Things have changed a lot - just look at the demographics of Ewing and Langseth users. And when you have at least two vessels - Atlantis and Langseth - operating principally as national resources, national should be the way to go. (Diebold)
  - I agree that there might be some advantage to having the office at an operator institution, as it provides an internal set of advisors (maritime personnel) who can provide feedback to the office easily. However, I do not see that this must be the case, and if a strong case can be made (i.e. an excellent successor at a



non-operating institution), then this should not be a problem. I would not see that we need to change this part of the charter, even if it does appear to be some presumption that it will go to an operating institution. I guess you can give the council the best input about this, as you have first hand knowledge of the benefits you have gained to make your job easier, because of your presence at an operating institution. In the end, we want the best person who is motivated to do a great job, and this should over-ride consideration of the actual location. (Hammond)

- I don't see a problem. The person is the key...not the institution. I would prefer an operator but see no problem with a non-op. Again, it is the person. The real key as I said is first getting the right person and we have proven we do a pretty good job of that. Then have a good honest way to give the person feedback. That also has worked well. (Atkinson)
- My inclination is to limit it to operating institutions. (Ricketts)
- We (ONR) would agree that the host institution should normally be an operator institution but non-operators should be allowed to compete. (Houtman)
- The present rules allow a non-operator institution to host the office, but that is pretty hard if they don't receive an invitation to submit a proposal. I can certainly see that operator institutions would generally have more expertise and interest in hosting the UNOLS office than non-operator institutions, but what is most important is to get the best team available. You mentioned that you can think of someone who would be good, but that person is from a non-operator institution. We shouldn't shut the door on that sort of possibility, so I favor keeping the first statement above ("normally" at a UNOLS operator institution), but inviting all UNOLS institutions to submit letter proposals if they wish. It would be interesting/helpful to have the historical perspective of how many letter proposals have been submitted in the past at the time of changing the office. (Gardner)
- I think operators have a real edge on non-operators in terms of experience, know-how, etc., so I would limit the rotation to operators. (Hine)
- The UNOLS Office should remain at an operator institution. It is critical that the Exec. Secretary have a working knowledge of what is involved in operating a vessel, how funding is carried out, etc. I am not sure of the level of involvement that non-operator institutions have in UNOLS, however, I do not see how an individual that does not operate a vessel can have the expertise needed, especially at a time when critical issues are being considered that concern the future of the oceanographic research fleet. (Dickson)
- I think the Office should be at an operator institution since the Executive Secretary seems to be usually someone who has been responsible for operating a UNOLS vessel; thus, they are familiar with many of the issues. Also, I think the major unnoticed task is the importance of the Office in the scheduling



process and only someone who has scheduled a vessel knows the gritty details of the whole system. (Hebert)

- Yes. While operating institutions have the background and first hand experience of the problems associated with ship operations, opening up the office to a wider range can get new ideas and ways of handling things into the mix. If this happens then the committee that interviews the candidates for Secretary will have to be careful in their reviews and recommendations. (Ustach)
- I think that the UNOLS office should be situated at an **operator's** institution, not a non-operator. The word *normally* does take care of the option for one or the other, but I think an operating institution would be better. (Rabalais)
- Standing as an operator institution is less important than qualifications of the proposed Executive Secretary put forward by the host institution. The Executive Secretary must have broad and deep experience in the academic world of seagoing ocean science AND in the many practical maritime issues pertaining to it. I think that this consideration, properly wordsmithed when Council puts out its RFP, will almost certainly serve to zero in on someone already affiliated with an operating institution, as you and your predecessors have been. I find it hard to imagine or to name persons at a non-operating institution who would have the combination of understanding of ocean science and solid maritime operational background that I think is vital in an effective Executive Secretary. (Knox)
- I like the current wording - the host institution will "normally" be an operating institution. The second part of the charter paragraph should be changed to read proposals should be invited from all "UNOLS institutions" vice all "UNOLS operator institutions". (Winslow & Taylor)
- The most important factor is the qualifications and experience of the Executive Secretary. This will favor someone from an operating institution, but I wouldn't preclude a non-operating institution from hosting the office if they put forward a suitably qualified person to the lead the office. (Detrick)

d. General Comment:

- In this time of cooperative, multi-institutional programs, I advocate that serious consideration be given to placing the UNOLS office at Consortium for Ocean Leadership on a permanent basis, instead of fine tuning the UNOLS charter to stay on something similar to the present course. The corollary is for UNOLS to be absorbed by COL. The concept is not original to me, but having heard it sometime ago and having thought about it extensively I firmly believe that it makes great sense for a number of reasons.



Speaking first to absorbing UNOLS into COL, this approach vests ultimate responsibility for UNOLS facilities in an elected board entrusted to lead and serve our community. Setting priorities is an important component of this responsibility. Nearly all UNOLS members are represented in COL. I would imagine that operational responsibility would sit with a standing committee comparable to the present UNOLS Council, and there would continue to be a full advisory structure. (There are obvious parallels in ocean drilling and ocean observing.) A tangible benefit would be the connection between the Executive Secretary and top leadership in the ocean sciences.

Even without such a major restructuring, I believe there is merit in simply stabilizing the office location. The notion in the charter that "the UNOLS OFFICE will rotate among [the operator] institutions" is contrary to the history of rotation which at the present pace will only be completed well into the 2100s. There is no significant advantage to this rotation, yet real costs. What is crucial is the role of the Executive Secretary. The present arrangement has the (sole?) advantage of having an executive secretary that does not need to move to Washington, D.C. Conversely stabilizing the location of the office will give continuity to and efficiencies of scale to the key functions need and a much easier interface, through proximity, to the sponsoring agencies. The provision that the "Executive Secretary, while administratively an employee of the host institution, shall act under direction from the UNOLS Chair and Council" is certainly achievable when all goes well, but a potential legal morass when not. (McDuff)

#### 4. Consensus?

- a. Term – everyone seems to agree with the five-year terms.
- b. Limit on tenure/competition – Most seem to agree that ten-year max is enough. Some are in favor of a renewable second term after a thorough review. Others felt that in addition to allowing renewal after five years, competition should also be allowed in addition to review.
- c. Non-Operator Institution Host – Some felt that the host institution should be limited to operator institutions and others felt that the nominated Executive Secretary was the most important factor. Several pointed out that the Charter does not preclude a non-operator from competing and could be left that way, however, invitations to submit proposals should not be limited to Operator institutions. I should note that those that presented arguments in favor of limiting to an operator institution discussed the experience and expertise of the Executive Secretary primarily, but some also mentioned the commitment of the host institution and the ready access to research vessel operations personnel at the institution.



5. Strawman changes to the Charter based on the input received are presented below. The Council should decide whether or not to present any changes to the Charter for vote at the annual meeting.





## DRAFT CHANGES TO UNOLS CHARTER – SECTION IVi – UNOLS OFFICE SELECTION

i.) UNOLS Office and Executive Secretary: A UNOLS Office shall be established for the purposes of providing staff support and secretariat services to UNOLS, the UNOLS Chair, Council, Executive Committee and other Committees as directed. The Office shall serve as a focal point for UNOLS correspondence and for central files on facilities, schedules, user requirements and related information. The Office shall advertise, arrange, support and report on UNOLS, Council and Committee meetings. It shall arrange and manage contracts for blanket services to the UNOLS fleet and UNOLS institutions under guidance from the Chair and Council, and at the behest of sponsoring agencies.

The UNOLS Office shall normally be established at a UNOLS operator institution. It is expected that the UNOLS Office will rotate among ~~these UNOLS~~ institutions. The UNOLS Chair, with the UNOLS Council, shall review UNOLS Office performance and activities ~~on about three year inter~~prior to the completion of the first five-year termvals (or at intervals controlled by the duration of funding grants or agreements) and recommend whether or not to renew the host institution for a second term. The Council may also consider any competing proposals at the time of this review. The Office may, if so suggested by review, be moved after ~~three, six or nine~~five years, and it would remain at a single institution for a period longer than ~~nine-ten~~ years only under extraordinary circumstances.

The UNOLS Office shall be headed by the Executive Secretary, an employee of the institution hosting the UNOLS Office. The Executive Secretary, while administratively an employee of the host institution, shall act under direction from the UNOLS Chair and Council. If it is necessary to select or replace the Executive Secretary, open competition for a host institution shall be held concurrently. The Executive Secretary is responsible for all UNOLS Office functions and other UNOLS duties as directed by the UNOLS Chair and Council. It is expected that the Executive Secretary will be thoroughly familiar with the operation and scheduling of academic research vessels and with UNOLS and Federal policies related to research vessel and facility operations.

Selection of an institution to host the UNOLS Office and of Executive Secretary shall be by open, competitive process. These selections ordinarily will be made concurrently. The UNOLS Chair shall invite all UNOLS ~~operator~~ institutions to submit letter proposals identifying their candidate for Executive Secretary and advancing their capabilities for hosting the Office. The Chair, with advice from the UNOLS Council, shall appoint an Evaluation Committee, organized with due regard for UNOLS institutions' interests, for the purpose of recommending the best proposals for host institution and executive secretary. The recommendation from the Evaluation Committee, with the review and consent first of the Council and then of the UNOLS membership, shall be transmitted to the ~~agency~~agencies administering the UNOLS Office grants or co-operative agreements. It shall then be necessary for the institution recommended as UNOLS Office host to submit a ~~grant~~ proposal to the administering ~~agency~~agencies. Contractual obligations between the UNOLS institution hosting the UNOLS Office and the funding agencies shall be the responsibility of those organizations.

Costs of operating the UNOLS Office will be federally funded and should be prorated among the funding agencies in accordance with their participation in contract and grant programs with the institutions, or by such other arrangements as may be agreed to by the Federal agencies.



Original Request for input sent to All UNOLS representatives, Council and Committee members along with key Federal agency representatives.

**Date:** June 25, 2007

**To:** UNOLS Council, UNOLS Representatives and Supporting Federal Agencies

**From:** Mike Prince, UNOLS Executive Secretary

**Subj:** Competition for next UNOLS Executive Secretary and UNOLS Office host institution.

1. The UNOLS Office has been hosted at Moss Landing Marine Laboratories (MLML) since May 1, 2000 and is currently being funded through the third of three Co-operative Agreements from NSF and concurrent grant from ONR. This third term will be our last and will end on April 30, 2009.
2. The current UNOLS Charter states that the UNOLS office will remain at a single institution no longer than nine years except under extraordinary circumstances. I do not know of any such extraordinary circumstances and I do not intend to continue as the Executive Secretary beyond the expiration of this term. I believe that it is important for the office to rotate periodically and I believe that nine to ten years at any one institution is adequate. Historically, the Office was at WHOI for about ten years and at the University of Washington and the University of Rhode Island for nine years each. It will be time in the next year to solicit and select a new Executive Secretary and host institution for the UNOLS office.
3. The procedures for selecting the UNOLS office are included in the UNOLS charter under section 4i, which I have copied below.
4. During our tenure as the host office for UNOLS we discovered that the three year renewable terms, with just a cursory evaluation by the UNOLS Council was somewhat at odds with the NSF requirements for five year review and re-competition of co-operative agreements for facility related organizations. In response the UNOLS Chair and Council conducted a more formal review of the UNOLS Office performance and solicited interest in hosting the UNOLS office prior to recommending the third term for MLML. We also decided that prior to starting the competition for the next UNOLS office host, we would examine the UNOLS Charter and the NSF requirements with the idea of making them more consistent with one another.
5. The UNOLS Charter does state, “The UNOLS Chair, with the UNOLS Council, shall review UNOLS Office performance and activities on about three-year intervals (**or at intervals controlled by the duration of funding grants**).” NSF has been moving towards five-year Cooperative Agreements and program managers are required to compete and re-compete awards. See the National Science Board (NSB) resolution below.
6. Another question to ask is whether or not we need to limit the host institution to a UNOLS Operating Institution. The charter says, “*The UNOLS Office shall normally be established at a UNOLS operator institution.*” It also says that the UNOLS Chair should “...invite all UNOLS operator institutions to submit letter proposals identifying their candidate for Executive Secretary and advancing their capabilities for hosting the Office.” UNOLS has moved over the years to make UNOLS an organization that is more inclusive of all oceanographic institutions, although there are still vestiges of the original core of Ship Operating Institutions. We still use ship-operating



institutions to determine a quorum at the annual meeting and we ensure that there are a mix of ship operating and non-ship operating institutions represented on the Council and FIC. On the other hand, we now allow and actually have a Chair from an institution that is not a UNOLS Ship Operator. I don't have any strong feelings one way or another. I believe that what is most important is to have a UNOLS Executive Secretary and staff that is knowledgeable and respected in the area of oceanographic research vessels and facilities and that the institution is committed to the principals of UNOLS and would support the operation of the UNOLS office. I can think of at least one individual that would be qualified, but would probably have to be associated with a non-operator. The charter doesn't prohibit non-operator hosts, but the presumption is that it will be a ship-operating institution.

7. Therefore, I believe the Council and UNOLS have three decisions to make:
  - a. Five-year increments: Should the charter be changed to reflect five-year terms with an opportunity for competition or re-competition every five years?
  - b. Limit on tenure at one institution: Should the charter be changed to allow an institution to compete for a second term with a limit of ten years total, except under extraordinary circumstances? Or, should we just provide for competition every five years and let the competition determine the ultimate length of an institution's tenure?
  - c. Non-operator Host Institution: Should UNOLS open competition up to all UNOLS institutions to host the UNOLS Office?
8. I request your immediate response regarding the three issues identified in Section 7. Please reply by July 6th so that the Council can review the feedback received during their summer Council meeting.
9. After receiving input and arriving at some preliminary conclusions, I would draft appropriate changes to the Charter that would then be approved by Council to include on a ballot measure for the Annual meeting. The portions of the charter that would need changing are highlighted in the text below. The results of the vote at the annual meeting would constitute the formal change to our procedures to take place prior to soliciting letters of interest early in 2008.



## **Current UNOLS Charter Language regarding UNOLS Office and Executive Secretary – Dated October 15, 2004**

Areas that might need modification are highlighted in Bold/Italic Text below:

i.) UNOLS Office and Executive Secretary: A UNOLS Office shall be established for the purposes of providing staff support and secretariat services to UNOLS, the UNOLS Chair, Council, Executive Committee and other Committees as directed. The Office shall serve as a focal point for UNOLS correspondence and for central files on facilities, schedules, user requirements and related information. The Office shall advertise, arrange, support and report on UNOLS, Council and Committee meetings. It shall arrange and manage contracts for blanket services to the UNOLS fleet and UNOLS institutions under guidance from the Chair and Council, and at the behest of sponsoring agencies.

***The UNOLS Office shall normally be established at a UNOLS operator institution.*** It is expected that the UNOLS Office will rotate among these institutions. The UNOLS Chair, with the UNOLS Council, shall review UNOLS Office performance and activities ***on about three-year intervals (or at intervals controlled by the duration of funding grants)***. The Office may, if so suggested by review, be moved ***after three, six or nine years***, and it would remain at a single institution for a ***period longer than nine years only*** under extraordinary circumstances.

The UNOLS Office shall be headed by the Executive Secretary, an employee of the institution hosting the UNOLS Office. The Executive Secretary, while administratively an employee of the host institution, shall act under direction from the UNOLS Chair and Council. ***If it is necessary to select or replace the Executive Secretary, open competition for a host institution shall be held concurrently.*** The Executive Secretary is responsible for all UNOLS Office functions and other UNOLS duties as directed by the UNOLS Chair and Council.

Selection of an institution to host the UNOLS Office and of Executive Secretary shall be by open, competitive process. These selections ordinarily will be made concurrently. The ***UNOLS Chair shall invite all UNOLS operator institutions*** to submit letter proposals identifying their candidate for Executive Secretary and advancing their capabilities for hosting the Office. The Chair, with advice from the UNOLS Council, shall appoint an Evaluation Committee, organized with due regard for UNOLS institutions' interests, for the purpose of recommending the best proposals for host institution and executive secretary. The recommendation from the Evaluation Committee, with the review and consent first of the Council and then of the UNOLS membership, ***shall be transmitted to the agency administering the UNOLS Office grant.*** It shall then be necessary for the institution recommended as UNOLS Office host to submit a ***grant*** proposal to the administering agency. Contractual obligations between the UNOLS institution hosting the UNOLS Office and the funding agencies shall be the responsibility of those organizations.

Costs of operating the UNOLS Office will be federally funded and should be prorated among the funding agencies in accordance with their participation in contract and grant programs with the institutions, or by such other arrangements as may be agreed to by the Federal agencies.



Title: Resolution Approved by the National Science Board at It's 346th Meeting, November 13, 1997 Concerning Competition, Recompetition and Renewal of NSF Awards

Date: November 13, 1997

Appendix D to NSB-97-241

NSB-97-224

**RESOLUTION APPROVED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD  
AT IT'S 346TH MEETING, NOVEMBER 13, 1997 CONCERNING**

**COMPETITION, RECOMPETITION AND RENEWAL OF NSF AWARDS**

Whereas the Committee on Programs and Plans has outlined, at it's meeting in November 13, 1997, the major principles and key issues in a report "Competition, Recompetition and Renewal of NSF Awards: (NSB 97-216) in the context of the various types of NSF Awards; and

Whereas the Committee on Education and Human Resources concurs in the principles articulated in the report;

Now, therefore, be it **RESOLVED**, that the National Science Board:

Affirms its strong support for the principle that expiring awards are to be recompeted unless it is judged to be in the best interest of U.S. science and engineering not to do so. This position is based on the conviction that peer-reviewed competition and recompetition is the process most likely to assure the best use of NSF funds for supporting research and education. And

Requests that the Director, NSF, take such steps necessary to ensure that NSF practices embody this principle.