

MS

File:
NCSGP
May 1996
Mtg

dbartlet@bigred.sr.unh.edu (David S. Bartlett)
Subject: Draft Director's Council Minutes
msandy@pen.k12.va.us
Date: Fri, 21 Jun 1996 16:09:50 -0400

>To: shoran@nmsu.edu, msandy@pen.k12.va.us
>From: dbartlet@bigred.sr.unh.edu (David S. Bartlett)
>Subject: Draft Director's Council Minutes
>Cc:
>Bcc:
>X-Attachments:

>Steve and Mary-

>Here are the draft minutes from our last Director's Council meeting. Send me any comments/corrections you would like incorporated before they are distributed to the attendees.

>Regards,
>David

> Minutes
> National Council of Space Grant Directors
> May 19, 1996
> Williamsburg, Virginia

>(Several standing committees of the Council, including the Executive Committee, met earlier in the morning to discuss issues related to their particular charges.)

>The Council meeting was called to order at 10:10 AM by Steve Horan, Council Chair. On behalf of the Council, he presented a plaque to Elaine Schwartz in recognition and appreciation of her dedicated efforts in the creation and formative development of the National Space Grant Program. Elaine is taking a new position with the NASA Office of Inspector General.

>Julius Dasch, Space Grant Program Manager summarized recent Washington events and the status of the Program as follows:

>- The NASA budget continues to be a major concern. Overall, the agency is in a downsizing mode, particularly at Headquarters. Cuts have been severe, but no Centers or large programs have been eliminated. Recently, a new target for budget and personnel cuts has been identified, with impacts which are uncertain.

>- Space Grant has experienced level funding which, in this environment, is viewed as a positive indication for the Program's success and continued health. Despite this success, there are programmatic issues which Julius described. The 5-year program evaluation identified a few consortia which were not performing adequately, and emphasis has been placed on improving these programs, with significant success. In addition, the evaluation identified a number of "middle tier" consortia which were generally performing well but had selected areas where improvements could be made. Julius would like to focus on these consortia, to raise the overall level to that of the "top-tier" consortia which the evaluation identified as excellent in all areas. Julius observed that performance seemed to be determined largely by consortium Directors. He encouraged Directors to strive for greater visibility for their programs.

}

>

>Julius also expressed concern regarding responsiveness to reporting requirements. A number of consortia were late with their annual reports, resulting in the Program Office being unable to compile its comprehensive program overview in a timely fashion.

>

>Julius identified diversity as a strength of the program, but was dissatisfied that the percentage of Fellowships awarded to underrepresented minorities fell from 23% to 21% during the last year. He challenged the Directors to increase the percentage of fellowships awarded to women from 39% to 41%, and to minorities from 21% to 25%. A concern from the floor was that while women and minority candidates should be and are encouraged to apply for fellowships, setting specific targets raises the issue of imposed quotas. Julius responded that he did not intend to specify quotas, but wanted to encourage renewed efforts in recruiting underrepresented groups to enhance this particular strength of the Program. An additional concern, expressed by several Directors, was that recruitment of minorities is intensely competitive, with other NASA and NSF programs often able to offer larger inducements than Space Grant consortia.

JD has asked for help in office recruitment area - strategies that work panel for sharing not good existing prog. neg.

>

>Julius stated that he planned to form a committee, consisting of a number of consortia Directors, to advise him on processes to improve overall Program quality.

Why not let his choices

>

>- Frank Owens, Director of the Education Division, reiterated that the Space Grant Program was doing well but should strive for improvement in the areas outlined by Julius.

>

>

>Reports were given from the Committees and Working Groups which had met prior to the general session:

>

>- Steve Horan said the Executive Committee was concerned that some individuals, and perhaps some NASA offices, had a negative perception of Space Grant, and that this may affect the program's ability to expand its role in NASA's outreach initiatives.

}

>

>- Brent Bowen, Nebraska Space Grant Director, reported that the Aviation Working Group had about 15 people in attendance. They identified a number of goals related to aviation which included: alerting Space Grant Directors to the existence of this interest group, including creation of an electronic mailing list of interested individuals; creating an aviation World Wide Web site (in progress); considering a full-day meeting related to aviation and its role in Space Grant; developing an on-line scholarly journal related to aviation (completed); and developing a white paper to inform Consortia regarding on-going issues and plans related to aviation (a draft will be distributed soon). Frank Owens suggested that contact be made with the NASA Centers having aviation/aeronautics charters.

>

>- Al Strauss, Tennessee Space Grant Director, reported for the Committee on industrial relations. He noted that private sector involvement in State Consortia was unevenly distributed, with greater participation in those States with resident NASA Centers. The Committee discussed the idea of facilitating affiliations with large companies that would be nationwide in scope, thereby involving State Consortia which currently have limited corporate involvement. Frank Owens noted that several major NASA contractors were collaborating on "Mission Home" - a \$1.5 million project to enhance aerospace's position in the national agenda.

X

>

>- Mike Wiskerchen, California Space Grant Director, reported for the CMIS

working group. The new, internet modules of CMIS are about 2 months from preliminary release. There has been no response from NASA regarding the Council's offer, initiated at the last Council meeting in Omaha, to assist with design as well as testing of the new version. Mike reiterated the group's desire to participate in "rapid- prototyping" of the new software, beginning as soon as possible, so that the new CMIS will be useful and user -friendly. Julius accepted the offer, but had some concern that the working group might not represent the needs of the broad spectrum of Consortia.

>

>

>Gary Moore, Wisconsin Space Grant Director and Chair of the nominating Committee, presented the slate of nominees for various Council offices and committees. He distributed ballots, one per Consortium, for voting on the slate, with results to be reported after lunch.

>

>

>John Wood of the Hubble Space Telescope Institute showed live demonstrations and "PC's In Space" software designed to illustrate physical principles and astronomical phenomena to students.

>

>

>John Yost (Univ. of Idaho) summarized recent national developments with regard to relationships between research universities and industry. The Council on Competitiveness and industry groups are concerned with the evolving relationships between government, industry, and academia, particularly in light of the end of the cold war. Interactions should be reoriented towards the "globalization" of markets. He gave some examples of new models for interactions between industry and academia, such as the "lean aircraft initiative," a collaboration of government, universities, and aerospace industry and labor unions.

>

>

>Following lunch Dick Henry, Maryland Space Grant Director, reported on STARS, the outreach program he has created and which involves Space Grant consortia in ultraviolet astronomy research. The Hopkins Ultraviolet Background Experiment (HUBE) which was to form a basis for STARS was not selected among the first MEDEX missions, but was highly rated and encouraged to repropose. In the meantime, STARS will be initiated through incorporating the consortia's "adopted" constellations into introductory astronomy classes at Space Grant colleges and universities. Dick distributed a brief description of a class project to create a WWW homepage for each consortia's constellation(s). He suggested that these be transmitted to faculty teaching introductory astronomy (i.e for non-science majors) as a way to stimulate interest as well as encourage exploration of the World Wide Web.

>

>

>Gary Moore reported on the election results as follows:

>

>Council Chair Elect: Mary Sandy, Virginia

>

>New Executive Committee Members: John Gregory, Alabama (1 year term)

Roberta

>Johnson, Michigan (2 year term)

Gary Moore,

>Wisconsin (2 year term)

John Wefel,

>Louisiana (2 year term)

>

>New Nominating Comm. Members: Richard Devon, Pennsylvania (2 year term)

*Spring 97
Bayford*

>
Kansas (1 year term)
>
West Virginia (2 year term)
>
Nevada (1 year term)
>
Mexico (2 year term)
>
>

David Downing,

Majid Jaraiedi,

James Taranik,

Steve Horan, New

*Peter Mark
1 yr end*

>Karen Wynn, Pennsylvania Space Grant Assistant Director, reported on her work in recruiting and retaining more women undergraduates in science and engineering. Women are the largest underrepresented group in these fields. Penn State University (PSU) has initiated a program called WISER for first year women majoring in science and engineering. Karen's research and review of the literature revealed some interesting aspects of women in science and engineering. At PSU, women dropout of or switch from technical majors more frequently than men, even though their grades are as good as their male counterparts. This and other evidence suggest that women choose science/engineering majors for different reasons and have different expectations than men. While most men report that they chose their major because they had done well in high school science/math, women frequently report that parental influence was more important in the choice of a science/engineering major. This may mean that women need more external support to sustain a technical major (e.g. research by Hewitt and Seymour at Colorado St. Univ.). Karen pointed out that intervention required constant energy and attention, and suggested measures such as training TA's and young faculty to be sensitive to differences in women's motivations and need for support.

>
>
>Julius Dasch took the floor to respond to questions. He announced that NASA Administrator Goldin planned to speak at the opening session of the National Spae Grant/JOVE Conference and to visit the consortia posters on May 20. ~~Frank Owens stated that he knew Mr. Goldin intended to challenge Space Grant to change, just as the agency as a whole was changing.~~ A question from the floor asked for clarification of the goals of the advisory committee Julius had described during the morning session. Julius summarized the committee's charge as helping him determine how to bring all consortia to a level of uniform excellence, consistant with the top tier identified during the last evaluation. He stated he didn't necessarily know the best process and wanted the committee's advice on achieving this goal. Gaylord Northrop (Arkansas) suggested asking the most successful consortia in each of the major Space Grant themes to describe their practices. This led to general discussion of "benchmarking" the most successful practices as a guide to all consortia. Julius noted that this was not a shift in policy to require each consortium to give equal weight to all National Space Grant priorities, but was intended to improve the overall quality of the Program.

>
>
>William Cutlip of Goddard Space Flight Center made a presentation on "Low Cost Access to Space." The Orbital Launch Services (OLS) program at Goddard is intended to provide "cradle-to-grave" launch services to appropriate users. He presented an example of the Student Explorer Demonstration Initiative (STEDI) in which OLS is providing the interface between three university-developed spacecraft/payloads and the launch provider - in this case the Orbital Sciences Corporation (OSC) Pegasus XL. He pointed out that capacity for secondary payloads was present on these and other planned launches, and he summarized the costs, orbital parameters, technical specifications and process for interfacing with these opportunities (summary

overheads of this information were distributed). Some funding is available through OLS to assist with payload integration, etc. for approved projects.

>

>

>Cary Pao of Orbital Sciences Corporation followed with further details on secondary payload opportunities on OSC launches. He proposed that Space Grant consider initiating a "Microsat" program for small, university-developed payloads to take advantage of the secondary launch capacity (summary overheads were distributed). Although costs are still significant, he suggested that by distributing costs among a number of participating consortia they could be brought down to a range appropriate to the limited resources available in individual States. During discussion, some Directors felt that even the modest amounts (~\$25k per participating consortium) mentioned would be beyond their capacity, while others saw the proposal as potentially feasible. Elaine Hansen, Colorado Space Grant Director, suggested a pilot with participation and contributions from Goddard, OSC, and interested universities. Mary Sandy, Council Chair elect, said she would put the idea on the Executive Committee agenda for further discussion.

>

>Steve Horan Adjourned the meeting at 3:45 PM.

>