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• NASA Student Ambassadors
• 20th Year Evaluation
• FY09 Budget Call
Minority Serving Institution
Partnership Development Competition

• Received 25 proposals
• Reviews/Panel completed
• Will announce results by end of March
• Anticipate up to 5 Awards
• Max. $150,000/proposal
Ralph Steckler/Space Grant
Space Colonization Solicitation

• Project Management assigned to Johnson Space Center
• Proposals due February 19
• Proposals review process initiated
• Anticipate announcing results by end of April
• Anticipate up to 20 awards
• Max. $70,000/proposal
Grant given to Space Grants Foundation
- 54 Student Ambassadors selected competitively from 50 different states
- MA, NY, SD, WY funding one additional student each
- DE, RI selections not yet made

2 of these selected to represent USA students at the IYA Opening Ceremony, Paris, January 14-15, 2009
- Rebecca Holmes, UNC Chapel Hill, NC
- Norberto Gonzalez, University of Puerto Rico, Arecibo, PR
A virtual student community designed to foster greater interaction and mentoring relationships among outstanding interns of NASA higher education projects. NASA Student Ambassadors will have the chance to participate in NASA events, and be apprised of employment opportunities and educational experiences. The net result of these interactions and opportunities will be increased skill development and greater likelihood of successfully completing their STEM degree and entering the NASA workforce. A major outreach effort of the community is to enhance communication with the 18- to 30-year-old STEM population.
The NASA Student Ambassadors will work alongside NASA scientists and engineers and will perform the following duties at NASA events and other NASA-related activities:

- Serve on student panel and at exhibit areas during major NAA events, such as 50th Anniversary and Hubble Telescope events
- Meet the Administrator: Spring 2009
- Polling and blogging forums
- Peer networking and mentoring
- Recruitment and Career Fair events
- Disseminate NASA internship, research, and education opportunities
20th Year Program Evaluation

Required every 5 years by the Space Grant
Implementing Rules and Regulations
(Federal Register Vol. 54, No. 88, Part 1259.400(b))

Desired Results and Outcomes

- **Agency-level**
  - Demonstrate to NASA’s constituents and stakeholders the impact and overall merit of the Space Grant consortium in each state as well as the overall benefit to the Agency in terms of Office of Education Outcomes I, II, and III.

- **Programmatic level**
  - Be able to make informed decisions about future allocations of Space Grant resources
  - Comply with OEd Strategic Coordination Framework for internal “evaluation of programs, projects, products, and activities”

**Anchored by the Space Grant Goal and Objectives**
Goal: Contribute to the nation's science enterprise by funding education, research, and public service projects through a national network of university-based Space Grant consortia.

Objectives (from the legislation):
1. Establish and maintain a national network of universities.
2. Encourage cooperative programs among universities, aerospace industry, and Federal, state, and local governments.
3. Encourage interdisciplinary education, research, and public service programs related to aerospace.
5. Promote a strong science, mathematics, and technology education base from elementary through secondary levels.
20th Year Program Evaluation

Network Participation & Responsiveness (NASA HQ Staff)

Program Performance & Results (Peers)

Space Grant Consortia

Program Performance & Results (External)

Affiliate Survey (Affiliates)
- Contents -- Evaluation of key elements of grant management
  - Compliance with deadlines and quality of submissions – Budget and CMIS
  - National meeting participation
  - “Contributions to the Network” beyond the consortium
  - Office space
  - Website review
  - After Hours Phone Check
Network Participation and Responsiveness
National Summary

Scale
4 = Excellent
3-2 = Good
1-0 = Poor

If Applicable

15th Year Improvement Plan and Report

- Budget Call with Longitudinal Tracking
- Annual CMIS Reporting
- National Meeting Participation
- Service to the Network
- Office Space
- PPR Compliance
- PPR Consortium Concurrence

Capability Enhancement Mean  Program Grant Mean  Designated Mean  National Mean
• Budget Call
  – **TIMELINESS**
  – Accuracy of longitudinal tables

• CMIS
  – **TIMELINESS**
  – **QUALITY**
Network Participation and Responsiveness
National Summary

Scale
2 = Excellent
1 = Good
0 = Poor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capability Enhancement Mean</th>
<th>Program Grant Mean</th>
<th>Designated Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Website Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Hours Phone Check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Website
  – 508 Compliance lacking
  – Using calspace (vs. NASA) link to the National Space Grant page  <however, not penalized>

• After hours phone check
  – Information not useful and informative
  – Non-identification of Space Grant
  – Confusion regarding which phone number on the website to use to reach the consortium office
Affiliate Survey

- Design, development, and methodology based on 2003 Survey
- Involved all affiliate or affiliate-like contacts in CMIS
- 28 Questions
  - Includes consortium goals and objectives, fellowship/scholarship program, consortium communications and interaction, consortium leadership, program impact, NASA and national program information
- Launched April 15, 2008
- Closed May 14, 2008
- 85% Response Rate (range = 62% - 100%)
  - 768 Surveys distributed/ 652 Valid surveys completed
- **39% of consortia had no avoidable issues with CMIS-contacts**
Kudos!
No avoidable issues regarding CMIS
Contacts as of March 17, 2008

Alaska
Colorado
District of Columbia
Delaware
Illinois
Mississippi
New York
Kentucky
Massachusetts
Maryland
Michigan
Minnesota
Missouri
Oklahoma
South Dakota
Tennessee
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin
Wyoming
2008 Affiliate Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Capability Enhancement</th>
<th>Program Grant</th>
<th>Designated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>4 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3 = Agree</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3 = Agree</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>4 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3 = Agree</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Emphasis</td>
<td>4 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3 = Agree</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Impact</td>
<td>4 = Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3 = Agree</td>
<td>2 = Disagree</td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affiliate Survey Demographics

- University/College: 62%
- Community/Junior College: 11%
- Nonprofit Organization: 8%
- Industry: 7%
- Museum/Science Center: 5%
- State/Local Government: 3%
- Other: 5%

Special Attributes:
- 7% HBCU
- 5% HSI
- 3% Tribal College
- 2% OMU
Respondent Tenure with Space Grant Consortium

- Less than 1 year: 7%
- 1-4 years: 32%
- 5-10 years: 34%
- More than 10 years: 27%
Clear evidence of demonstrable contributions to NASA Education Outcomes and alignment with national Program goal and objectives

**Outcome**
- **Outcome I** *(Primary Investment)*
  - Fellowships/Scholarships
  - Research Infrastructure
  - Higher Education

- **Outcome II** *(Secondary Investment)*
  - Pre-college

- **Outcome III** *(Tertiary Investment)*
  - General Public
  - External Relations

**Process**
- Goals and Program Reporting *(CMIS)*
- Analysis & Interpretation of Findings *(PPR)*
- Description of Impact/Results *(PPR)*
- Peer Review *(Directors/Centers/Program Staff)*
- Analysis and Result *(Program Manager)*

**Management & Operations**
- **Outcome I** *(Primary Investment)*
  - Fellowships/Scholarships
  - Research Infrastructure
  - Higher Education
- **Outcome II** *(Secondary Investment)*
  - Pre-college
- **Outcome III** *(Tertiary Investment)*
  - General Public
  - External Relations
• Engaged services of *Evaluation and Action Research Associates L.L.C.* for development of rubrics, reviewer training design and conduct, analysis of reviewer scores, preparation of reports, and interpretation of overall results

• PPR Reports submitted on October 3, 2008

• Reviews complete
  
  – 88 Reviewers: Space Grant Directors, Space Grant staff, NASA HQ and Center personnel, and others familiar with Space Grant

  – Minimum of 6 reviews of each PPR Report – 4 directors, 1 staff, 1 NASA/Other (most PPR Reports received 7 reviews)
PPR Results Summary

Results Graph

Scale
7-6 = Excellent
3-5 = Good
2-0 = Poor

Capability Enhancement  Program Grant  Designated  National
20th Year Evaluation Observations
Frequent PPR Weaknesses

• PPR Writing
  – Clear articulation of Goals and Objectives
  – Report not written in a manner which facilitated review
  – *Impact and Results* not adequately presented
• CMIS data and PPR text concordance
• Articulation of SMART Goals
• Target metrics
• Assessment and Evaluation
• Longitudinal tracking of significant awards – more than just fellowship/scholarship participants
20th Year Program Evaluation

Results

- **Pass**
- **Pass (with Weakness)**
- **Pass with Deficiency**
- **Serious Deficiencies**

All three components were factored in for the final determination

- NPR
- Affiliate Survey
- PPR
Pass
– Overall clear evidence that consortium is making demonstrable contributions to NASA Education Outcomes and is aligned with National Program Goal and Objectives
– 5-year grant (FY 2010 – 2014)

Pass (with Weakness)
– Generally clear evidence of demonstrable contributions
– Weakness(es) will be noted in results cover letter and will need to be addressed in FY09 Proposal
– 5-year grant (FY 2010 – 2014)
Pass with Deficiencies

- Insufficient evidence that consortium is making demonstrable contributions to NASA Education Outcomes and is aligned with National Program Goal and Objectives in some elements
- Improvement plan to be included with FY09 Proposal
- Staff mentoring
- Satisfactory improvement after one year as evidenced through review of FY 2009 Progress Report = 5-year grant (FY 2010 – 2014)
  - Unsatisfactory improvement after one year will initiate changes in consortium management
Serious Deficiencies

- Insufficient evidence that consortium is making demonstrable contributions to NASA Education Outcomes and is aligned with National Program Goal and Objectives across several programmatic elements as well as deficiencies that appear to be systemic in nature
- Improvement plan to be included in FY09 Proposal
- Staff mentoring
- Staff site visit
- Meeting with all affiliates
- Satisfactory improvement after one year as evidenced through review of FY 2009 Progress Report = 5-year grant (FY 2010 – 2014)
  • Unsatisfactory progress after one year will initiate changes in consortium management
In March:

- **Cover Letter notifying Director of Result**
- **Executive Summary Report – PPR, NPR, Affiliate Survey**
  - Summary graphs
- **PPR Results Report – includes graphs and reviewer comments**
- **NPR Results Report – includes graphs and reviewer comments**
- **Affiliate Survey Results Report – includes graphs and other quantitative and qualitative data**
- **Guidance on interpreting Results**

- **Will receive Cover Letter directly**
- **Will be required to download package of results reports from 20th Year Evaluation website**
• Different format and guidelines for FY 08 Progress Reports
  – Reduce the amount of time required to prepare
  – Streamline the progress report
  – Based on “key grantee performance data” for all Office of Education projects

• Reports currently being reviewed
  – Have received approval to begin incremental funding in March

• FY 2009 Budget Call will depend upon final NASA appropriation passed by Congress and 20th Year Evaluation results
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>FY 2008</th>
<th>FY 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Report Call</strong></td>
<td>12/18/2007</td>
<td>1/8/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Budget Figure</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress Report Format</strong></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Condensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NASA Appropriations</strong></td>
<td>12/19/2007</td>
<td>HAS NOT BEEN PASSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congressional Approval of NASA Operating Plan</strong></td>
<td>Final budget was contingent upon Op Plan</td>
<td>Final budget (probably) not contingent upon Op Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency determination of Space Grant budget available</strong></td>
<td>Contingent upon Congressional approval of NASA Operating Plan</td>
<td>Contingent upon NASA Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Space Grant Budget Call</strong></td>
<td>3/12/2009</td>
<td>Contingent upon Agency determination of Space Grant budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1st Incremental Funding</strong></td>
<td>4/21/2008</td>
<td>[March 2009 – funds made available from Continuing Resolution allowance]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for all your efforts this past year!!
A Work in Progress
- All “Internship” opportunities funded by NASA will use a single entry point – national and Center-based
  - Interns (undergraduate) and Fellows (graduate)
- Single application site
- Consistent due dates – probably 3 x/year
- “Broker-facilitators” will assist students in completing applications and identifying best-fit programs
- Students would get a standard ID for the system which they would keep as they applied for additional opportunities