

**National Council of Space Grant Directors  
Fall Meeting Minutes  
Seattle, Washington  
October 25-27, 2012**

**Thursday October 25**

Robert Winglee (WA) welcomed everyone on behalf of the Washington Space Grant Consortia. He introduced his staff and the volunteers that are assisting with the meeting. He gave some instructions about the meeting, presentations, Internet, etc.

Robert explained the logistics for the Museum of Flight for tomorrow evening's banquet.

Yervant Terzian, SG Council Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:15 pm.

Yervant introduced Carl Person.

Yervant discussed his plans for the meeting and his approach to leading the organization. He discussed a variety of topics... working group chairs... OEPM... the Carl Sagan Planet Walk in Ithaca, NY and Hawaii... he then explained that some strategic planning would be conducted the following afternoon as part of our council meeting.

Yervant announced that he is ending the practice of door prizes and substituting instead presentations on the big questions about the universe. He presented a variety of facts, figures, and anecdotes related to space, science, and education.

Scott Tarry (NE) presented the minutes from the last national meeting. Peter Sukanek (MS) moved that the minutes be accepted. John Wefel (LA) seconded the motion. Pat Hynes (NM) suggested the minutes be sent out earlier to give more time for feedback. The minutes were accepted as submitted and corrected.

Peter Sukanek gave the Treasurer's report. He noted the balance in the endowment and the amount in the expendable account. He explained the interest, earning, and expenditures including the transition meeting and the space grant booth and participation in the space symposium. See the attached report. Peter entertained questions. There were no questions.

Yervant then spoke about the national goal for 1million STEM graduates and 100,000 STEM teachers in the next decade.

Carl Person (NASA HQ) addressed the council...

He extended greetings from Leland Melvin and Roosevelt Johnson. He introduced the HQ team... Katie Pruzan, Sasha Korabov, Mike Cherry, Lateicia Durham, Jeppie

Compton, Susan Stewart, Crystal Bassett, Frank Six, Larry Cooper, and Mablelene Burrell.

Person discussed the transition in NASA Education across the entire agency. There has been considerable negotiation and bargaining, which has focused on learners, education, and institutions.

FY13 is a transition year to a new portfolio. Mission Directorates and NASA Centers will continue to provide direction, but everything will align with new lines of business.

Person discussed an innovative collaboration with Angry Birds, and noted that there was no NASA funding for this important partnership, which suggested perhaps a model for future partnerships with NASA.

Person noted that the overall goal is to create a transformative and scalable education portfolio, which is ideal, but a very difficult task. He presented a slide highlighting the four lines of business... showed key slide... Design Strategies → Business Lines ← Supporting Elements

Person emphasized the need to reduce or eliminate redundancy at the national level as directed by OSTP and GAO studies. He pointed to the desire to create a national STEM education policy.

Person noted that there is a new emphasis on working from anywhere and being accessible through communication technology as a way work more efficiently and effectively.

Person reiterated NASA Education Vision Statement: To advance high quality Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education using NASA's unique capabilities. He highlighted the NASA Internship, Fellowship, and Scholarship Line of Business (NIFS) – pointed to SOLAR-OSSI as a sign of the progress that has been made in this area. He noted the importance of the STEM Engagement Line of Business, which includes public outreach and education, experiential learning opportunities, and STEM challenges. He discussed what Diane DeTroye will be doing in this area. Person also discussed the Institutional Engagement Line of Business, which is designed to support efforts to build and sustain capacity for STEM.

Katie Pruzan (NASA HQ) thanked everyone for getting their performance data in on time and working with Mike Cherry to detect and correct errors. She presented a chart of FY11 Funding Sources with detail about match. She also discussed the STEM Engagement line of business and said Diane wished she was at the meeting.

Katie noted that work with underrepresented students is going well. She discussed longitudinal tracking and the flow of students in an out of the tracking process.

Noted that 84% of students have been retained in STEM, which is down from earlier years, but a reflection of tightening of measurement processes. Discussed increasing importance of SG efforts in Educator Professional Development. In the area of Institutional Engagement, Katie noted Space Grant's success in penetrating the market for MSI, especially Hispanic serving institutions.

Carl Person noted that Space Grant's story has not been told well within or outside NASA. One of his priorities is to make sure top people at NASA HQ and the scientists and engineers out in the centers to know what impact Space Grant has made on NASA's goals and objectives.

Person identified FY13 Programmatic Priority Areas: Leveraging and Strengthening Strategic Partnerships, Diversity and Inclusion, Workforce Development, and Precollege Educators/Education.

Person reiterated that NASA is seeking partners who bring their own funding. He said it was important to consider the development of new partnerships with entities that have buy-in.

Person noted that Space Grant accounts for most of NASA's success with underrepresented and underserved students, but we need to do more. He emphasized role of community colleges in reaching these goals. Numbers of HBCU and tribal colleges are fairly constant, but Hispanic serving institution numbers are growing substantially.

Person said that Space Grant needed to "Continue doing what you're doing, but do a little more..."

Person said sequestration unlikely to happen, but what happens to avoid sequestration is unknown and will have an impact on Space Grant and NASA EPSCoR.

He noted that in FY12: 91% of funding went to consortia after a 5% assessment by NASA HQ and an additional 4% assessment for program costs.

Person discussed national and regional meetings and changes to the historical model. He said spring national meetings remain unchanged, but beginning in 2013 fall national meetings will only be held every other year. Beginning in 2014, regional meetings will alternate with national fall meetings.

Person ended his remarks by noting the loss of leaders in space exploration... Janice Voss... Sally Ride... and Neil Armstrong. He reminded the assembled body that we don't want to forget those who have made extraordinary contributions to NASA and the world.

Carl Person then entertained questions from the Council.

Mary Sandy (VA) asked about leveraging partnerships and suggested that we underrepresent these partnerships in the way we report. She said there are probably better ways to report and that current strategy creates a disincentive as well for reporting match because of reporting requirements. Katie Pruzan said NASA is aware of this and working with Roosevelt Johnson to standardize how leveraged partnerships are reported.

Jack Higgenbotham (OR) noted that states, like Oregon, without HBCU haven't been allowed to collaborate with other SG to make an impact in this area. Person said this was an area that needed discussion and that there are many HBCU that aren't able to make connections, for whatever reason. Person said that perhaps there is a way for SG to help in this area. Katie noted that it is only the money that can't cross state lines and that there are examples of states without MSI being able to collaborate with other SG and HBCU successfully. She said that there are ways the impact of such projects on faculty and students can be reported.

Steve Ruffin (GA) noted the importance of making sure SG is visible and better understood in NASA. Person said there are a number of ways to accomplish this and said he'll work with Yervant. Yervant noted that there is a new committee on Public Relations and that Jaydeep Mukherjee (FL) is chairing it.

Robert Winglee (WA) called for a break at 3:18 pm.

Resumed meeting at 3:36 pm.

A number of interesting presentations were given in the afternoon session. Adam Harris from SpaceX discussed his company's plans for growing private space flight. He presented information about SpaceX's organization and infrastructure. He was asked at end about how Space Grant can help SpaceX. Harris suggested that the internship program is best opportunity for Space Grant to help organizations like SpaceX

Chris Lewicki from Planetary Resources discussed his company's interest in mining asteroids.

Student presentations were given by Nathan Silvernail... Embry-Riddle grad student with Florida Space Grant, Noelle Bryan with the Christner Research Group sponsored by the Louisiana Space Grant, and the iGEM Team.

### **Friday, October 27**

Robert Winglee (WA) welcomed everyone back for the second day of the meeting and explained logistics for the day.

Yervant Terzian (NY) welcomed everyone back and introduced the day's first speaker.

**Roy Arvidson, Washington University spoke about Exploring Mars Using the Opportunity and Curiosity Rover.** Arvidson noted that he helped write the first Missouri Space Grant proposal and has funded undergraduates with Space Grant resources. He explained that Opportunity was only designed to travel about 600m, but has actually gone 35,000m.

Arvidson entertained a number of questions from the Council.

Q: Have you found any carbonates?

A: No... no surprises, but haven't been to the most likely places yet

Q: Do the ripples and the delay in control of the vehicle frustrate you?

A: Mobility engineers examine data and directions conveyed to vehicle. He noted that larger wheels on Curiosity have proven to be much better than the smaller wheels on Opportunity.

Q: Do you have a Mars time watch?

A: No.

Q: Do you expect to find fossils and what would you do?

A: Microbial level is most likely...

Q: Will we put a human on Mars during the century?

A: Depends on long term vision for NASA, international cooperation, and funding. Having humans in situ would speed analysis and exploration.

### **Angela Des Jardins (MT) provided a National Space Grant Student Satellite Program Update**

Main focus is survey of student led flight projects among the Space Grants. Originally conducted in 2008, a new version of the survey was circulated in 2012. Ten states have not yet responded, but are still encouraged to do so. Findings suggest that student led flight projects are important for recruiting and retaining students in STEM disciplines. 61% of Space Grants do ballooning and nearly all use GPS-Ham radio for tracking. Communication with FAA is an issue worth considering. Seems to be regional differences within FAA. 64% of Space Grants are doing CubeSats. There are testing facilities and on-line support materials to assist new programs. CubeSat launch initiative (CSLI) opportunity is now open and there is a surplus of launch slots. Other launch opportunities are evolving. Space Grants are encouraged to pursue these opportunities.

### **Gary Brandt – Northwest Indian College – Involving Native Americans in STEM Activities Through Space Grant Support**

Brandt talked about his background and how you can get involved in rocketry with little training and experience. He explained that his students range in age from 19 to 78. He noted that tribal colleges provide an incredible environment. He discussed getting involved in First Nations Rocket Launch and the support he received from Goddard Space Flight Center. He has been involved in outreach (water rockets at head start program) and his students are now competing in the USLI, which gave them good experience with paperwork, planning, and organization. They have been limited by existing infrastructure, but they are good thinkers and problem solvers.

### **Terry Shehata (ME) – Maine Student High Altitude Platform (MeSHAP)**

Shehata explained that the goal was to develop an undergraduate program. He noted the importance of partners and funding support. He pointed to a collaboration with NASA Ames and assistance from Greg Guzik at LSU, which was important for success.

### **Jason Black – Florida A&M University – MICI (Minority Innovation Challenges Institute) – MICI: A model for virtual training in STEM**

Black explained that program facilitates interaction and mentoring between underrepresented students and NASA scientists and engineers. Virtual environment provides access to presentations from contest organizers, subject matter experts, and NASA Education representatives. MICI also provides small grants to support MSI team participation in challenges and contests.

### **Eric Day (DC) – Spring 2013 National Meeting**

Day provided information about the meeting, which is scheduled for February 28 – March 2 at the Sheraton Crystal City (Rooms are available for \$195 per night)

### **Cassandra Runyun – (SC) Fall 2013 National Meeting**

Runyan said information will be sent soon regarding the meeting scheduled for Charleston, SC October 13 – October 15, 2013.

### **Jeff Hoffman (MA)– Zero Robotics program update**

Hoffman discussed the SPHERES Experts Network – Zero Robotics ISS Programming Challenge – provides opportunity for middle school students to be involved in ISS – The Experts Network provides a funded opportunity for college students to get involved... \$5K from MIT and \$5K from SG... MIT summer 2-week program... return to their home state to mentor high school students who want to become involved in SPHERES...

### **Greg Guzik (LA) – HASP update and information about WBEE**

Guzik highlighted the Ballooning for High School and University Level Students and Teachers program developed in Louisiana. He gave overview of workshop and the 4 day agenda for teachers to complete assembly of payload kit (soldering and debugging and software).

### **Linda Smith – NASA JSC – Melissa Edwards – Museum of Flight – and Amber Agee-DeHart – (VA) -- NASA Aerospace Scholars Program**

Smith, Edwards, and Agee-DeHart provided an update and overview of program for high school juniors. Successful completion of the online interactive program allows students to compete for spots in intense on-site summer program. There was some discussion about the value of these programs as part of the pipeline into Space Grant and STEM.

### **Mablelene Burrell – NASA GSFC – Goddard Internships and Partnerships...**

Burrell reported that 52 out of 407 summer 2012 interns supported by Space Grant... She said NASA is hoping to provide more opportunities during school year... described poster session competitive awards... interns participate in career networking... information about the applied engineering and technology directorate hands-on engineering design team program... discussed senior internship opportunity, which is designed for students who have already completed a regular internship with GSFC...

### **Jonathan Lunine – Cornell University – Exploring the Outer Solar System**

Lunine discussed issues and challenges related to the exploration of the outer solar system.

### **Joey Key (MT) Diversity Survey**

Key gave an update on the diversity survey that was conducted. Response rate was low. She invited states to let her know about their intentions to report data for the survey.

### **Strategic Planning Workshop**

Yervant (NY) gave an introduction and explained the rationale for a strategic planning workshop. He discussed history of strategic planning efforts in Space Grant – gave overview of process for the afternoon’s work. Reminded group that there are some constraints such congressional directives, NASA HQ objectives, fiscal limits, program expansion, and the needs of 1,000+ affiliates

## **John Wefel (LA)– National SG History and Accomplishments**

Wefel provided an overview of the Space Grant and focused on its history as a partnership program based on land and sea grant funding for federal and university partnerships. Wefel highlighted a number of events including Public Law 100-147, Julius Dasch as first program manager, CMIS program, first strategic planning meeting at Woods Hole, MA where the National Council of Space Grant Directors was formed.

**Jaydeep Mukherjee (FL) gave overview of a SWOT analysis.**

## **Jack Higgenbotham discussed NASA SG evaluation processes**

Higgenbotham asked if the evaluation processes are serving SG needs and NASA needs. He described how data can serve each consortium as they communicate with affiliates and as a tool for comparing or benchmarking themselves against other consortia. Asked for ideas about how data are helping us do what we need to do. Discussed importance of continuity of program and evaluation processes. Process of evaluation for 25<sup>th</sup> year review will be similar to review at 15<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> years. Suggested that directors, especially new directors, contact Katie Pruzan and also approach a senior director for mentoring.

A number of evaluation ideas and questions were discussed...

- Current evaluation system doesn't give us adequate means to show partnerships and leveraging
- Advanced notice of what we need to provide will help us provide what is needed
- Created MSWord document templates that will make entering data into OEPM easier
- Old student data tables much easier and useful than OEPM forms...
- Tehseen prepared survey monkey form for affiliates to put data into form that works well with survey monkey...

The discussion evolved into a conversation about a broader set of issues...

Carl Person (NASA HQ) said Space Grant is the wedge for making an impact at the K-12 and Higher Education levels. He noted that Space Grant is extraordinarily important to NASA. He explained that the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 requires among other things, partnerships and collaboration with other federal agencies in pursuit of national STEM education goals.

Person discussed SG Objectives and how they align with NASA Objectives. He noted that the national network is key asset and that SG critical for recruiting and training STEM workforce. He suggested that relationships with Schools and Colleges of

Education are critical to reaching national goals and said that informal education partners are key in this as well.

Person reiterated that Space Grant aligns well with all four lines of business. He reminded that we need to encourage students to apply for “national” scholarship and fellowship opportunities. Person also pointed to an Educator Professional Development solicitation which will emphasize partnerships with colleges of education, industry, and informal education providers.

A member of the audience offered a question and comment about the short fuse for MSI solicitations, especially when the institution doesn’t have the knowledge or experience to put a proposal together. Person said that failure is part of the learning process. He has heard for too long that institutions don’t know any minority students or minority institutions to work with. He suggested that Space Grants be proactive in getting up to speed about MSI.

Sharon Brandt (WI) said that asking for growth when budgets are being cut is a problem. Person confirmed that there will be no augmentation. This was followed by some discussion about use of FY12 dollars to give some jurisdictions 4<sup>th</sup> year money. Why were dollars not used for augmentation instead of extending year four money to 30 jurisdictions. Person said there was an internal decision to expend the money in this way.

Chris Koehler (CO) said that Space Grant has grown through different eras and has been able to accomplish a considerable amount, but there seems to be a fundamental shift. He said he was worried about the erosion of the great work we’re doing because the base level of support is declining and suggested our long term prospects are in jeopardy. Person said he shares concerns that decreased levels of funding will have an adverse impact on level of accomplishment for Space Grant. He referenced a drop in funding for MUREP and expressed hope that there would be a more level and consistent level of funding.

Frank Six (NASA) noted that 30% drop in NASA Education funding is unprecedented and he asked if Carl could explain why this was happening. Person said that in prioritization process Education is not a top priority... He acknowledged that this doesn’t make a lot of sense... He said he knows why budget was cut three years ago... based on performance... but current cuts don’t make sense...

Pat Hynes (NM) asked about getting year 4 funding in next quarter. Majid Jaridi (WV) interjected that we’re not going to be made whole, we’ve actually been cut over 30%. He explained that we’re not going to get that money. It’s gone.

Denise Thorsen (AK) asked about next solicitation and substantive area. Person said he could not say what that would be, but did say that it would be consistent with four lines of business and the priorities that stem from those lines.

## **Steve Ruffin (GA) discussed SG Goals and Objectives for the next Decade.**

Ruffin talked about Strategic Planning Committee and explained process and outlined three things he wanted to cover: 1) Process; 2) Sample Survey Results; and 3) Plan

Steve then discussed survey instrument and results. The proposed plan was handed out to the assembled group.

Ruffin noted some major proposed actions – most important actions space grant should take to improve its effectiveness in over the next 10 years. Steve went over the revised objectives, and highlighted the proposed strategies for successfully reaching these objectives.

Yervant Terzian (NY) provided a recap of the strategic planning effort and thanked the afternoon's speakers. He reminded everyone that the presentations will be posted on the web. He invited people to send their comments and suggestions to Steve so everyone's thoughts can be added to the discussion. At some point the directors will be asked to vote or approve the new plan.

A general discussion about Space Grant followed.

Greg Guzik (LA) noted that reduction in state funding has an impact on the ability of instructors to devote time and energy to funded opportunities like those that Space Grant provides. He sees this as a threat that should be added to our SWOT Analysis.

Chris Brown (NC) noted that SG doesn't want to be seen as the 800 lb gorilla in the NASA Education portfolio... not sure how we get past this... how do we cooperate if our programs are in jeopardy of being cut?

Carl Person agreed that SG plays an important role in the NASA Education portfolio.

Suzanne Weaver Smith (KY) noted that the return on investment is not well measured or accounted for and that investments in young faculty and the eventual return on that investment needs to be articulated better.

Representative from NASA Ames asked about effort to send students abroad or bring international space people to US. Mary Sandy (VA) pointed out restrictions on foreign travel and concerns about collaborating with Chinese and others.

Terry Shehata (ME) asked Carl Person about the status of being a capability enhancement state. Shehata said that locked some Space Grants into a variety of requirements and needs. He asked about the opportunity to change priorities. Person said that there is flexibility within priorities and suggested a further conversation with program officer.

There were some questions about current CAN...

How does Space Grant continue to be involved in projects after they are awarded if award is made to institution other Space Grant?

Katie Pruzan explained that the Space Grant will get credit in data reporting and evaluation, but PI on the award will be responsible for reporting the data. Terry Teays (MD) reiterated that if Space Grant is not connected to the project, this is problematic.

Katie explained the requirement, but noted that the program can be structured in any way the proposer wants so the Space Grant has the opportunity to address this issue with proposers.

James Flaten (MD) asked if the proposed activity is on top of existing opportunities. Katie said the intent is to focus on retention of cohort of students at risk of attrition from STEM.

## **Saturday, October 27, 2012**

### Mission Directorate Working Group Reports

**Aeronautics - Haim Baruh (RI)** – discussed proposal to develop webinars that would be made available to students... this proposal was not accepted by the MD... group is shifting its focus to having more aeronautics on the Space Grant meeting agenda... highlighted helicopter/UAV workshop in CT... also looking at developing student aeronautics programming at centers...

**Human Exploration and Operations – Wally Fowler (TX)** - Frank Six gave update on HEO education programming and support... discussed how to get students involved in HEO... senior design program that was hosted by KSC still exists, but without funding... techport.nasa.gov... also discussed what the working group might be able to do within and outside NASA to expand the group's activities and have a greater impact... suggested that working group meetings be lengthened to provide more time for conversations.

**Office of the Chief Technologist – Luke Flynn (HI)** introduced Denise Thorsen (AK) as new co-chair of OCT WG... noted that OCT will become the Space Technology MD in next couple of years... spoke about Centennial Challenge program and Game Changing technology programs... It was noted that the OCT is interested in cross-cutting technological developments... Power System Challenge has been announced... high density energy storage issue... hardware demonstrations are expensive, but perhaps SG, universities, and industry can partner... UAV challenge... using drones in national airspace... asked what SG could absorb in terms of cost to

put 3U cube sat into useful orbit... \$30-\$40K for 1U has been norm, but ElaNa has provided no-cost opportunities for successful projects...

**Science... Terry Teays (MD)**... e-mail updates have been sent to working group members... Terry and Co-chair have been visiting NASA PO to make sure they understand SG and how SG can support collaborative work... emphasized intra-SG efforts that can reduce cost... noted survey that was implemented... half SG responded... good information about SG involvement in launches... offering to Carl Person to help us connect former SG students and faculty to speak about their involvement in various launch and other NASA activities... discussed pilot effort to have SG supported students attached to missions that are not at NASA Centers... some of these can be connected to small missions at universities... but also Hubble... Space Grant would develop position and program statements that would help place students with these missions... decided to continue with internship program...

### **Space Grant Foundation - Peter Sukanek (MS) and Mark Fischer (SG Foundation)**

Introduced members of the Foundation Board and invited SG members to send suggestions and comments to Pat Hynes.

First item was election for foundation board. Since fall meetings will now be held every other year, the board is proposing that the off-year elections be held electronically.

The second item was the recent audit, which was clean and noted the SG Foundation's effort for going paperless.

Peter explained that the Foundation Board believes the foundation should continue offering services via contract, but should also direct its energies towards fund raising. Mark Fischer then reviewed the Foundation's organization and work.

### **Bill Garrard (MN) - Space Grant Bylaws changes and Foundation elections**

Garrard presented a revision of the bylaws of Space Grant Council of Directors. Peter Sukanek moved that bylaws changes be accepted as proposed. Tom Sharp (AZ) seconded. Chris Koehler (CO) asked if this was an issue that should be discussed. He suggested that it might be better to have the chair appoint the vice chair rather than have the vice chair elected. The decision was made to focus on the proposed changes and defer the decision about how the vice chair is elected/appointed to the executive committee who would decide whether or not to bring the issue to the council at a future meeting.

Garrard presented the ballot and called for nominations from the floor. There were none. John Wefel (AL) moved to accept slate as presented and Peter Sukanek seconded. Accepted by acclamation.

## **Consortium Coordination Session**

Carl Person (NASA) introduced Mike Cherry (NASA).

Mike Cherry discussed deadlines and other issues related to data collection. He noted that the Space Grant data archive opened in June and two people per state have been given access. If a jurisdiction doesn't have access, please let him know.

Discussion about OEPM and performance activity reports. Apparently there was some trouble logging into system. A workaround is being utilized to get data in for those who had access problems. He invited those who had not turned in their forms to do so soon.

Cherry announced that there will be OEPM training session in December. He said data will be input into system from mid-December to mid-January. He reminded that issues other than log in issues can be addressed to OEPM help desk.

Tehseen Lazzouni (CA) asked about FY11 data and FY12 data and what did Mike Cherry mean by saying that data was going to be entered in mid-December. James Flaten (MN) asked when FY12 data would be entered and Mike said next year.

James Flaten (MN) asked about the training session and asked for dates as far in advance as possible and multiple dates if possible. Mike said he would attempt to make multiple dates available.

Laurel Zeno (VT)... asked about FY12 and if he talking about financial data.

Chris Koehler (CO) thanked Mike Cherry for his efforts to respond quickly to requests for information and assistance with data collection and input.

Carl Person discussed additional coordination issues...

The schwag or swag policy was discussed. Are umbrellas in bags for conference considered schwag? No because it was part of meeting registration, but it does give appearance of schwag.

Put simply, do not use NASA money for schwag.

Laurel Zeno (VT) expressed concern for getting SG and NASA name out in public without being able to give out items with branding and website information. Talia Jurgens (TX) asked about button making machine. Sasha Korobov (NASA) said pin and button making was still acceptable.

Schwag is an issue that is subject to audit and the consequences can be significant according to OMB circular 821.

Sasha reminded that match funds, since they are considered as funding for the NASA-funded project, cannot be used for schwag either.

Carmen Fuchs (IA) said the distinction made for items included in registration costs doesn't make sense. Sasha reminded us about the appearance of using registration fees for schwag.

A discussion about Annual Performance Goals followed...

Carl Person said he will send copies of performance goals for FY 13.

John Wefel (LA) asked if this means that new and different information will need to be collected. Carl said no.

Carl showed a logic model chart that was impossible to read even from the front of the room. He then invited the audience to ask questions. He noted that questions about the current solicitation should be directed to him via email so that they can put together a FAQ.

Carmen Fuchs (IA) asked about electronic signature requirement and the need to send in a hard copy as well. The need for both was confirmed.

Sharon Brandt (WI) asked about the org chart that Diane had shared previously and asked if that org chart and contact information could be sent out again.

James Flaten (MN) asked about dates of performance for current CAN. Carl said it will start when NSSC sends notice and guessed that March would be likely start.

Tehseen Lazzouni (CA) asked about a telecon to discuss the CAN and was reminded that such a telecom can only be in response to written questions that are submitted for the FAQ. Sasha reminded that specific questions or guidance is not permissible.

Tehseen Lazzouni (CA) asked about how to keep track of repeat participants in OEPM so that data is accurate. Mike Cherry said they are working to better align data needs with OEPM process. There was a discussion about unique participant counts. OMB has apparently made this an issue for Summer of Innovation... Carl invited suggestions for resolving this issue in a way that promotes best practices. Laurel Zeno (VT) suggested process they use in Vermont to count students.

Ramanathan Sugumaran (IA) asked question about RFP and the limit on two proposals per state. He was specifically interested in about collaboration between states. Carl Person said if two states were collaborating, they could only submit a maximum of four proposals.

Sharon Brandt (WI) asked about data collection and the longitudinal tracking software used by the foundation. She suggested that perhaps there is software that can be shared. It was noted that OEPM has a mechanism to avoid double counting if names are entered, but this is limited to those who receive significant support. OEPM does not have similar capability for those who are not receiving significant support.

Sasha suggested reading the solicitation carefully about points of contact.

LeTeicia reminded everyone to make sure we're keeping her in the loop on contacts with NSSC.

Yervant thanked NASA staff for their participation in the meeting.

### **Regional Breakout Sessions**

Western Region report – Chris Koehler (CO) – discussion about 2014 regional meeting to be held in Boulder, CO – discussed partnering opportunities within region for current and upcoming solicitations... ballooning workshops, spectrograph workshops, and rocketry competition at regional level... 2016 meeting in AZ

Northeast – Raji Patel (MA) – 2014 regional meeting in MA... discussed collaboration on teacher development workshops... investigating possibility for holding workshop in July... possibly at Tufts or at Challenger Center at Framingham State University.

Southeast Region – Jaydeep Mukherjee (FL) – discussed student workshop in Huntsville in 2013 – space hardware clubs... brainstorming to help students develop hardware clubs... discussed wing design competition sponsored by KY SGC... discussed future meetings and will continue conversation...

Great Mid-Western – Ramanathan Sugumaran (IA) – two topics discussed... regional meeting in 2014, which will be held in Iowa... discussed hosting poster competition for students... discussed improvements in meeting... also discussed regional rocketry competition which is sponsored by Wisconsin...

Mid-Atlantic – Dick Henry (MD) – good news and bad news... best discussion ever about who they are and where they are going... next meeting in 2014 in Virginia...

Yervant offered a few closing remarks. He noted that Great Idea 8 called for a strategic planning workshop. He noted that we have begun to accomplish that. Among the other great ideas is number 28, which is to have a conference of our space grant students, where they can highlight their work. Gary Slater (OH) reported that there hasn't been much progress on holding such a conference, but they are talking to DC meeting organizers to see if student poster session could be added to program. Yervant suggested getting in touch with him to facilitate the development of the student activities.

Yervant asked that space grants send names and contact information of the best space grant students from the various jurisdictions. He wants to highlight the accomplishments of those students who were sponsored by space grant.

Yervant ended the conference and wished safe travels to everyone.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Scott Tarry, Secretary  
National Council of Space Grant Directors