

Charge to the GeoPRISMS “mid-life” Review Committee

In 2011 (into its tenth year of funding) the ancestral MARGINS Program went through a major evaluation by an external review committee (Prof. Tony Watts, chair). Several key recommendations were made by the Watts’ committee, most of which were incorporated into the new GeoPRISMS Program that followed. The Watts’ Committee also recommended a periodic (5-yearly) independent review of the new program. As the GeoPRISMS Program approaches its important “mid-life” milestone (fifth-year anniversary) in 2015, it is deemed desirable by NSF to step back and review the progress of this special program to date and its plans and promise for the future, as well as its management structure. This is considered especially appropriate in view of current budgetary constraints.

Purpose:

A. To review the GeoPRISMS Program and provide comments and recommendations to the Divisions of Earth (EAR) and Ocean (OCE) Sciences on the following science issues:

- 1) What are the major accomplishments to date of the two GeoPRISMS initiatives [Subduction Cycles and Deformation (SCD) and Rift Initiation and Evolution (RIE)]? To what extent have the stated goals of the Science Plans been achieved at the primary focus sites to date?
- 2) To what extent are the remaining stated science objectives of these initiatives (as stated in the science plans) achievable in the next five years?
- 3) In view of the budgetary constraints, has the phased deployment of resources (fiscal and instrumental/logistical) been a successful funding model?
- 4) Are there any major gaps or research opportunities that remain for each initiative?
- 5) What are the strengths/weaknesses of GeoPRISMS approaches to achieving amphibious research goals? The amphibious (ship-cum-helicopter) fieldwork approach will be tried for the first time in summer 2015. Could this be a model for deployment elsewhere in the Program?
- 6) In view of the pace of progress and known budgetary constraints should the program continue with its current suite of primary sites, or should the community rethink its priorities and focus on fewer sites to accomplish more of the stated objectives of the science plans?

B. Provide advice to EAR and OCE about the Program on management issues:

1. Has the GeoPRISMS Office been an effective source of communication, management, coordination and dissemination of results for the broader geosciences community? How effective is the GeoPRISMS Newsletter and its Website?

2. Currently the GeoPRISMS Office costs ~ 12 % of the annual Program budget. Is this cost appropriate? Are there other services/assistance that could be effective vehicle for how the Office meets the community's needs?
3. How effective are IEDA data archives and tools for GeoPRISMS research? Are there other collaboration facilities that are important for GeoPRISMS research?
4. In what way does the program Office enhance GeoPRISMS PIs' broader impacts?
5. The GeoPRISMS Steering and Oversight Committee (GSOC) is tasked with providing continuous advice and focus for the Program. What types of advice are most crucial for program's success? Could they be performing additional duties to enhance their effectiveness?

Relevant Documents:

1. GeoPRISMS *Science and Implementation Plans* can be seen on the GeoPRISMS website at: <http://geoprisms.org/research/science-plan/>
2. GeoPRISMS review documents prepared by the Office and Steering and Oversight Committee:
 - a. Executive Summary
 - b. GeoPRISMS as a decadal program
 - c. SCD achievements
 - d. RIE achievements
 - e. Program management including office activities and databases
 - f. Education and Outreach
 - g. Other impacts; national facilities & international partnerships
3. Appendices to 2:
 - a. NSF program solicitation
 - b. Awards made
 - c. Bibliography
 - d. GeoPRISMS meetings and demography
 - e. GSOC membership
 - f. Student prize winners
 - g. DLP speakers and metrics
 - h. Science nuggets contributed by the community