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Launch of the Five-Year Space Grant Evaluation (2010-2014)

2010-2014 Evaluation
• Focused on national program performance, but including state consortia performance review
• External evaluation with NASA OEID oversight

Past Evaluations
• Focused on state consortia performance
• Internal evaluation led by NASA Space Grant program team

This study builds on past SG 5-year evaluations while refining the evaluation design with stakeholder input.
Five-Year Space Grant Evaluation (2010-2014)

- Draft evaluation questions address the following topics:
  - Compliance with Public Law 100-147 and alignment with the priorities of NASA Education and NASA research and technology development
  - Program management practices, including the application and award process
  - Consortium-level and overall program impact
  - Identification of effective practices in consortia partnerships
  - Challenges, barriers, and constraints to obtaining high-quality results
SG Evaluation Phases*

1. Evaluation Planning
   - Community consultation on evaluation questions, existing data sources, and past SG evaluation methods and rubrics
   - Data quality assessment
   - Evaluation planning

2. Data Collection & Analysis
   - Collection and analysis of existing data held by NASA and other stakeholders
   - Anticipate continuing some processes from past evaluations and introducing new processes

3. Reporting & Recommendations
   - Comments period for draft report
   - Community discussion of recommendations

*This information is TENTATIVE, and for planning purposes only
Factors Influencing SG Evaluation Planning

• Joint purpose of program improvement and accountability
• Use of existing valid and reliable data that tell the Space Grant story
• Building on the methods of past evaluations
• Sensitivity to minimizing burden on stakeholders
• Involvement of Space Grant community

• Anticipated Completion of Phase 3: May – July 2015
Phase 1 Evaluation: Next Steps

- Procurement of external evaluator for Phase 1
- Recommendations from SG stakeholder groups for representatives to consult with evaluator
- Consultation process with stakeholder representatives on evaluation questions, existing data sources, and past SG evaluation methods and rubrics/metrics
- Follow-up with sample of SG stakeholders to review and assess existing data for viability for use in responding to the evaluation questions
- Development of evaluation plan
OEPM Reporting

• FY12 Reporting
  - Access
  - Student Award Profiles/Records

• FY13 Reporting Period
  - Pre-management: Complete
  - Post-Management/Activity Data: May 16th

• Bugs/Business Processes/FAQ’s

• EPSCoR Onboarding
LaTeicia Durham
Space Grant Solicitations: 2010-14

2010:
- Space Grant (year 1) base award
- Congressionally-directed augmentation
- Consortium Development Competition

2011:
- Space Grant (year 2) base award
- Congressionally-directed augmentation

2012:
- Space Grant (year 3 & some year 4) base award
Space Grant Solicitations: 2010-14

2013:
- Space Grant (year 4 & some year 5) base awards
- Innovative Pilot Opportunity (for educators and student retention)

2014:
- Space Grant (remaining year 5) base awards
- Targeted Competitive Opportunity for Community Colleges and Technical Schools

New Space Grant Solicitation
Business Processes

No-Cost Extensions (NCE)- The program office is expecting NCE requests from most consortia in 2015. Submit requests electronically https://www.nssc.nasa.gov/nocostextension.

Final Regs on Grants and Cooperative Agreements

• OMB Circular A-21 relocated to 2CFR, Part 220: Cost Principles for Education Institutions
• http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_default/
Business Processes

Budgets

- Budget Revisions (See guidance document from Program Office)
- Pay attention to labor costs. If labor costs for grants exceed 100%, the grant will be flagged for review
- Make sure internal controls are in place
- Monitor the draw-down of funds
- No de-obs/ re-obs
Program Office Improvements

- Increased communication with SG consortia (via e-blasts, website, telecons, reviewer briefings, director’s orientation, etc)
- More efficient review and award process
- Increased transparency
- Flexible and scalable program (program can be adjusted with changes of budget, national and agency priorities)
- Data Collection in OEPM
Theresa M. Stanley
Recipient

- Complete proposed work
- Send in reports in a timely fashion as indicated by the Required Publications and Reports sheet in the award documents
- Draw down in accordance with procedures
- Be prepared for obtaining an A-133 audit (If recipient has expended $500,000 or more in Federal Funding in a year)
- Comply with 2 CFR Part 220 (OMB Circular A-21) Cost Principles for Educational Institutions
- Comply with 2 CFR 215 Uniform Administrative Requirements
  
  [Link](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/circulars/a110/2cfr215-0.pdf)
Recipient

• Obtain Grant Officer approval for changes to work, key personnel, and budget as required (See Subpart 1260.125)
  http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/pub/pub_library/grcover.htm

• However, some re-allocation is allowed: Subpart 1260.72 in the Grant and Cooperative Agreement Handbook states:

  § 1260.72 Adherence to original budget estimates.
  (a) Although NASA assumes no responsibility for budget overruns, the recipient may spend grant funds without strict adherence to individual allocations within the proposed budgets, except that recipients must comply with prior approval requirements for property and subcontracts as provided in § 1260.27 and 1260.33.
  (b) The revision of budgets and program plans are covered in § 1260.125.
Approval

• Prior approvals are required from Grant Officer for:
  - Equipment costs (in excess of $5,000) not original proposed
  - When awarding a subcontract/subaward for any work not originally proposed
  - Foreign travel not originally proposed
  - Changes in scope or objective of the project/program
  - Change in key persons specified in proposal or award document
  - Absence greater than three months, or a 25% reduction in time by PI
  - Need of additional funding
  - Transfer of funds allotted for training allowances (direct payment to trainees) to other expense categories
  - Required by OMB Circulars 2 CFR Part 220
Report Reminders

• A reminder will be generated 90 days prior to anniversary date
  • The reminder is sent to the Technical Officer, PI, and the Grant Officer

• If the report is not received:
  • A delinquent notice is sent a week after the report due date
  • A second delinquent notice is sent a week later
  • A third delinquent notice a week later
  • A week later it is elevated to the Grant Officer

• Example:
  • Anniversary date: 5/16/2014
  • Report due date: 3/16/2014 (60 days prior to the anniversary date)
  • Reminder is sent: 2/16/2014 (90 days prior to the anniversary date)
  • Delinquent notice: 3/23/2014 (one week after report due date)

• Reports should be sent to the Technical Officer and the NSSC at
  • nssc-grant-report@mail.nasa.gov
Budget and Budget Justification/Detail

- **Direct Labor**
  - Level of effort and separate breakout of fringe for all categories

- **Rates**
  - Indirect and Fringe Rates should not be higher than the negotiated rates
  - If no agreement, then need basis of computation and/or other grants/contracts of federal agencies with same rates

- **Travel**
  - Number of trips, travelers per trip, destination, and duration
  - Breakdown of costs: airfare, lodging, meals, ground transportation, registration fee
  - Separate domestic and foreign
Budget and Budget Justification/Detail

• Equipment
  • Description, breakdown of costs, basis of estimate (i.e., quotes)
• Subcontractor
  • Statement of work and Budget with detail
• Supplies and Materials
  • Description, breakdown and basis of estimate (i.e., quotes, internet research)
• Publications
  • Estimated number of publications, cost per page and color figures
• Other cost
  • Identified and broken out
Examples of Unallowable Costs

• Alcoholic Beverages (Unallowable)
• Foreign Research (Unallowable)
  • NASA funding may not be used for foreign research efforts at any level, whether as a collaborator or a subcontract.
  • The direct purchase of supplies and/or services, which do not constitute research, from non-U.S. sources by U.S. award recipients is permitted.
• Cost incurred in the work of another Grant (Not Allocable)
• Cost of $6,000 for one person for two day/one night trip from Dallas to Houston, TX (Not Reasonable)
Telling Your Story

- Twitter
  - @NASA_SpaceGrant
  - @NASAedu
  - @NASA
- WAR
- NASA Express
- Data Calls
- Website
Website

- Scrolling Gallery
- NASA Ed Page
- Twitter Feed
- Express Sign-Up
- Streamlined Information
- Story Submission Information
- Active Solicitations
The NASA Education EXPRESS updates from NASA and STEM associates about workshops, internships and fellowships; applications for grants or collaborations; promotions for student and educator opportunities; online professional development; and other announcements.

On February 27th, the EXPRESS message was sent to 19,157 EXPRESS subscribers, 23.6 thousand NASA Education Twitter followers and 5.97 million NASA Twitter followers. Through the use of social media, the EXPRESS message has been shared with approximately 6.01 million people.
Annual Performance Data Reports

Narrative reports required 60 days prior to the award anniversary date each year.

• Used by ARCD to:
  • Evaluate performance of Consortia – excellence and weaknesses
  • Present information to the public through Office of Ed webpage
  • Provide specific consortium information for visits, calls, etc.
  • Roll up performance data for reports to Office of Education and NASA management offices
  • Extract data and narratives to respond to requests from Congress, White House, and evaluation agencies
How to Write a Good APD Report

- Follow the directions – so read them. Some changes each year.
- Look through the template and follow it. Some changes each year.
- Include all sections (see the next slide).
- No tables, pictures, etc. – just narrative.
- Please do not change the formatting except where instructed (Program Description).
- Microsoft Word document only – pdf files are not acceptable.
Annual Performance Data Reports Template

- PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

- PROGRAM GOALS

- PROGRAM/PROJECT BENEFIT TO OUTCOME (1,2,& 3)

- PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

  **Outcome 1**: Contribute to the development of the STEM
  **Outcome 2**: Attract and retain students in STEM – mostly teacher prep
  **Outcome 3**: Build strategic partnerships and linkages between STEM formal and informal
Annual Performance Data Reports Template

- **PROGRAM CONTRIBUTIONS TO NASA EDUCATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES**
  - **Student Data and Longitudinal Tracking**
  - **Diversity**: of institutions, faculty, and student participants (gender, underrepresented, underserved)
  - **Minority Serving Institution Collaborations**: Summarize interactions.
  - **NASA Education Priorities**: Accomplishments related to the “Current Areas of Emphasis” stated in the 2010 Space Grant solicitation. Report on areas that apply to work proposed in your proposal and budget
Annual Performance Data Reports Template

• IMPROVEMENTS MADE IN THE PAST YEAR
  Describe significant change(s) within the consortium

• PROGRAM PARTNERS AND ROLE OF PARTNERS IN PROJECT EXECUTION
  List the institutions that comprise the consortium
APD Report Review Debriefing

- In response to your requests, we are developing a debriefing mechanism.

- Details soon!
Consortia Kudos!

- Contributions and workshops featured in NASA Express, the WAR and website
- ECC Participation with Charlie Bolden
- Cubesat Selectees – RI, NM, MI, FL
- DC Space Grant
- OEPM Participation
Thank You!