

STAC Review Process: Kicking off a Revision

Michael C. Runge, *USGS Eastern Ecological Science Center
at the Patuxent Research Refuge*

**Chesapeake Bay Program
Science & Technical Advisory Committee
Quarterly Meeting
13-14 September 2022**

Motivation

- We seem to have lost oversight of documents that go out in the name of STAC
- Engagement with STAC after the workshop is haphazard
- Our review process does not align with the review requirements of several constituent agencies
 - Especially, statutory obligations under the Information Quality Act for federal agencies

Scope

- Start with our bread-and-butter
 - STAC Workshop Reports
- There are other products that go out in the name of STAC
 - We'll get to processes for those later

Sketch (proposed)

Role	Responsible Party
Publisher & Editorial Board	STAC
Editor-in-Chief	Denice Wardrop
Associate Editor	Appointed by STAC for each workshop report
Peer Reviewers (min. 2)	Selected by AE; may be STAC members who aren't on the workshop committee, or can be external
Authors	Workshop Steering Committee

Process (proposed)

1. Authors submit draft workshop report
2. STAC (or EB) appoints an Associate Editor (STAC member)
3. AE solicits ≥ 2 peer reviews
4. Authors respond to reviews, revise report
5. (If there are federal authors that require additional review, this happens at this point)
6. AE works with authors until all our satisfied
7. Presentation to STAC
 - Authors present content
 - AE summarizes the review comments and responses
 - STAC votes to accept the report
8. Authors work with EIC and CRC staff to format and publish report

Next Steps

- Convene a small committee (volunteers?)
- Draft revised review protocol
- STAC reviews draft protocol (Dec 2022)
- Committee revises
- STAC approves final protocol (Mar 2023)
- (Meanwhile, start to implement on trial basis...)