National Space Grant Directors' Meeting
Las Cruces, New Mexico
October 28-31, 2007

Program Managers'/Coordinators' Meeting Minutes
October 29, 2007 – 2:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
(the session actually started about 2:45 p.m.)

*The meeting was called to order by James Flaten, Minnesota Space Grant Consortium, who also welcomed everyone to New Mexico and thanked everyone for attending.*

*James announced that coordinators who were voting for his/her Director needed to proceed to the Directors' meeting ASAP.*

*A get-well card was passed around for Dorcas Metcalf (Rhode Island) who was unable to attend the meeting.*

## Presentation by Johnny Erickson, Goddard Space Center
*"Space Grants and Goddard Space Flight Center's Combined Intern Management Systems"*

• Dave Rosage (NASA Academy) introduced Johnny Erickson, Web, Database, and System Administrator, from NASA's Office of Higher Education.

• Johnny began his presentation and indicated he has been with the program since its inception which was first introduced through the Virginia Space Grant Consortium. Johnny's goal is to have a vehicle that can be improved for all users and would welcome any input for improvements. Johnny's philosophy is *"How can we help you?"*

• Copies of the Applicant Review – Manage Applicants pages (Slides 19 and 20) were distributed as well as Johnny's entire presentation (PDF copies are attached). Goddard is developing software and procedures to combine parallel internship processes into common applications.

• Johnny spent a fair amount of time walking us through the history of the NASA online application process. For example, in 2003, GSFC and VSGC created an online application for the NASA Academy (2 programs—Academy ARC, Academy-GSFC). Applicants not placed in the Academy were placed in SIP. He indicated the process did not work too well the first year resulting in a stigma attached with Academy vs. SIP as well as hard feelings. Approximately 800 applications were received during the Program's first year.

• In 2004, a new in-house application was developed for the same two programs with 1,110 applicants. In addition, accounts were created for Reviewers and Space Grants. In the *"Other Opportunities Section",* interns could apply for SIP, APL, IVV, and SAWDRIP if not selected. It was mentioned that other programs felt the runner-up interns circumvented their selection processes and the interns resented the placement

•In 2005, there were 8 programs (i.e., Academy-ARC, Academy-GRC, Academy-GSFC, APL, IVV, Robotics, SAWDRIP, SIP)  Applicant total increased to 1,767 and multiple applications were combined into one "CORE" application (Combined Intern Application 1.0) resulting in joined common data.  Online scoring of Academy applications was added as well as interviewer accounts.  Additionally, Space Grant Endorsement + Review + Terms and Conditions were added.

•In 2006, there were 13 Programs (i.e., Academy-GRC, Academy-GSFC, Academy-MSFC, Academy-Intl, APL, HIP, IVV, Robotics-ARC, Robotics-GSFC, SAWDRIP, SIECA, SIP, Summer Faculty).  Estimated number of applicants is somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 due to inaccurate accounting (Combined Intern Application 1.0).  The process was reorganized to easily add programs, questions, and users.  The Mentor Intern Request form was added enabling position descriptions to be added.  Additionally, basic statistical information, group reviews, robotics scoring, mentor accounts and reviews were added – first year for a completely paperless review process!

•In 2007, the application received a face lift to match the NASA website (Combined Intern Application 2.0 and Intern Management System 1.0) and had 2,284 applicants.  The following enhancements were made which piloted Intern/Mentor matching algorithm with late-requesting mentors:

  - Redesigned security (encrypted)
  - More secure user administration
  - Reduction of redundant accounts
  - Better control of information

•In the Post Application process, "Random-Round-Robin" reviews were created which eliminated group bias and reduced reviewer workload.  Academy Select Process was changed to pre-nominate applicants.  Statistics were expanded and for the first time, data was available to display minority fallout.  The application also went through an extensive review by NASA's Equal Opportunity Office.

•Future plans in 2008 (Combined Intern Application 2.0) include simplifying the application based on EEO and other input includes the following:

  - Instructions consolidated, standardized, and "hidden"
  - Redundant questions removed or rewritten
  - Combined pages
  - Standardized schools and skill sets
  - Addition of "Can We Help" phone-conference session
  - Addition of video Relay Service accommodations to increase accessibility for interns who are hearing and sight impaired (Note that application has been 508 Compliant since first deployed.)

•Additional future plans (Review System 0.5 and Intern Management System 1.0) include the following:

□ Split the application system and review system to allow Space Grants and mentors to see external applicants;
□ Improve intern / mentor matching algorithm to:  remove embedded projects, add standardized set of skills, and use as primary placement tool;
□ Expand Intern Management System to:  gather intern documents (i.e., Acceptance, End-of-Summer), evaluations, surveys, expanded statistics, and also export data to Johnson Intern Tracking Database (or others)

•A flow chart for the application process can be seen in Slide 11 of the attached presentation.

•The balance of Johnny's presentation focused on minority recruitment.  There is a gap between minority percentages in academia/industry and NASA.  A concentrated effort is underway to increase the level of minority applicants by:  Space Grants, NASA, GSFC Office of Higher Education, GSFC Equal Opportunity Office and NASA Academy Alumni Association.  Denna Lambert, GSFC, offered her assistance (i.e., events, clubs, and personnel experienced in minority recruitment) if needed (Denna.S.Lambert@nasa.gov or via phone (301) 286-0844).

•Last year, 46 percent of applicants starting the application were minority as defined by NASA EEO.  There is room for improvement – minorities in completed application pool shrank to 35 percent.  For additional 2007 application statistics, please refer to Slides 13-15 in the presentation.  Johnny also mentioned it was imperative to get Space Grants involved in the process earlier and also simplify the application process.  This will allow us to see the status of applicants from our respective states, motivate applicants, and find out who hasn't applied. This will also keep recruiters personally involved with the applicants.  The plan is to expand *"How did you hear about us"* fields in the database, create email list for recruiters containing their applicants, and also provide status reports on progress of applicants.

•At this point in the presentation, Johnny walked us through the applicant review process (Refer to Slides 19-25) which will enable Space Grants to:

   - See a list of applicants who live and attend school in their state;
   - View applications;
   - Endorse applicants;
   - Reject applicants;
   - Set funding;
   - Add reviewers

•A list of common problems were discussed (i.e., forgetting to click the Rank button; entering a per/intern amount rather than a total amount; confusion about when funds are committed.) Offers are made based on the amount entered in the "Total Funds" field.  This is the Space Grant commitment to fund the interns.

**Note that the combined intern application does not represent all programs at NASA or even GSFC (yet).**

•A reviewer account was added for all Space Grants which allows Space Grants to set up individual review accounts and allows decision makers to easily collect the opinions before endorsing applicants.  Reviewers can see the list of interns, have a vote option instead of "endorse" and cannot rank applicants or provide funding information.  Votes are updated in real-time.  A sample Add Reviewers page is shown in Slide 23, but is being rewritten.  Other updates in development include:  column selection, submit a team of reviewers form, additional statistics **(Johnny needs our input here),** and implement new rules about making offers (i.e., Space Grants must be contacted before offer is made (done now, but not a hard/fast rule.)

•Johnny concluded his presentation by stating he is available to assist us (i.e., How can he help us better to meet our goals?)  He offered the following examples:
- End of summer/mid-summer reports from interns;
- Promotional materials;
- Greater returning-intern involvement with Space Grants;
- More year-round partnerships;
- Minority recruitment (refer to prior information on Denna Lambert)

•Recapped how Space Grant helped (Refer to Slide 26)*:

□ 168 Interns placed
- 120 funded by Space Grant
- 94 half funded ($480K in stipends)
- 26 fully funded

□ Funding Sources
- $1,338K  Total ($574K Space Grant (42%); $435K Program (33%); $329K Mentors (25%)

□ Space Grants
- $857K offered
- $564K allocated
- $293K remaining

*Results as of May 2007*

## Important Dates (for Goddard only)

Application................................................................................ November 15 – January 14
Space Grant Review ....................................................................... January 28 – February 18
Notifications ................................................................................February 26 – March 16

## Q&A Session

•It was mentioned that there was some confusion about an *"unwritten rule"* that in addition to the funded amount, transportation to/from the Center (i.e., round-trip airfare) was also provided to the student.  Some folks indicated they were not aware of this, and it is also difficult to budget.

•Terry Teays (Maryland) suggested it would be great to have a position description from the mentors.  Johnny is addressing this.  Mona Miller from Marshall stated this is always a struggle to get a description from the mentors.

•There was also discussion about allowing mentors to see funding amounts – (i.e., if SGs indicated full funding, the mentors would be less likely to support the student.)

•Linda Cory (Kansas) thought the project description list was confusing.

•Laurel Zeno (Vermont) regarding the Hubbell project.  It was very discouraging because the mentors were not willing to invest time.

•There was additional dialogue about the application and it was suggested having a drop-down menu for the funding piece.

## Coordinators-only part of session

James made the following announcements:

•Requested everyone sign the attendance sheet being passed around.  (See page 10 below.)
•Announced one vote per SG if a vote is taken during the meeting.
•Thanked Laura Stacko (Ohio) for recording the minutes during this meeting.
•Introduced new members within the last 12 months:
     - Tehseen Lazzouni (California)
     - Glenda Winslow (Montana)
•Reminded everyone to sign the card for Dorcas.

The following two presentations were made:

## 1) Carmen Fuchs (Iowa)

•Carmen reminded everyone about the NASA Space Grant Program Coordinators' Home Page exclusively for our reference:  http://www.pc.spacegrant.org/

•A replica of the Home Page was distributed, and Carmen spent time discussing the GSFC Grants Status for PI's link under Miscellaneous.  The grant status can be reviewed by providing PI name, or NASA Grant Number at the following site: http://grantstatus.gsfc.nasa.gov/grantindex2.cfm  You can use the phone number on this site to ask questions regarding your grant.  It does not get you to your grant specialist, just the assistants.  Once your grant has *"awarded"* status allow a week or two for arrival, before calling.

•Carmen reviewed a sample NASA Grant and Cooperative Agreement form from Iowa to show the relationship of the document to the Grants Status page (Refer to CF PDFs Link):

- Item 1 – Grant/Cooperative Agreement Number (red oval);
- Item 14 – NASA Accounting and Appropriation Data:  PR Number (blue oval);
- The yellow stars show areas which should be reviewed after each supplement receipt;
- The green designated areas show contract officer with date of signature, negotiator (or contract specialist as listed on the GSFC site), amount of action, and (hopefully) receipt date stamp.

•Carmen reviewed the X.500 NASA employee directory site located at: http://www.nasa.gov/centers/glenn/about/GRCfind.html.  Use this site to locate your contract specialist contact information to forward to your contracts office to request a fax of supplements, if you have not received the paperwork within two weeks of "*awarded*" status.

•Carmen indicated that Tehseen (California) maintains the National SG page.  **Please check the information for your state and report any changes needed to Tehseen.**  Here is the link: http://calspace.ucsd.edu/spacegrant/contacts/directors/dir_directors.html

2) Sharon Brandt (Wisconsin)

•Sharon reported to the group on the results of a possible liaison position to the Directors' Executive Committee (EC).  First, she provided the background that led to the creation of the idea.

•At the Spring 2007 director's meeting, April Christensen (formerly of Idaho SG) and others suggested the possibility of someone representing the Coordinator rank and file as a member of the SG Directors' Executive Committee mainly *"to contribute and enhance the committee, to educate and offer assistance."*  As a result, a committee of ten volunteers was formed to find out what kind of position would be welcomed by the EC and to draft a follow-up position description if necessary.

•Sharon represented the coordinators at a Directors' Executive Committee Transition meeting held in Boulder, Colorado, in August, 2007.  The following options were presented, with a recommendation from the coordinator's group (after discussion with EC members) to adopt option 3.

1. Full voting member of the Committee
2. Full member without voting rights
3. Representative to the Committee that would act as a liaison between the Committee and Coordinators  (this person would be present at all meetings but would gladly leave if the Committee wished to discuss private matters)
4. Representative to the Committee that would act as a liaison between the Committee and Coordinators  (this person would be present via telecon or in-person and only on issues they were invited to be present for)
5. Other

•Following Sharon's presentation in Colorado, William Garrard, Chairman of the EC, prepared the following proposal describing a coordinator liaison (similar to option 4 in the list above) to the EC.  The policy was provisionally accepted, with a formal vote scheduled for the Las Cruces meeting of the EC.

> In order to enhance communications between the Coordinators in the various Space Grant Consortia and the Executive Committee of the Council of Space Grant Directors, the following policy is established.  The Coordinators of the various Space Grants would, by some democratic process which they determine, select a Coordinators' Representative to the Executive Committee.  This person would act as a liaison between the Committee and Coordinators and would be present via teleconference or in-person, to participate in discussions on issues which he or she was invited to comment on by the Chair of the Council.  The Chair would consult with the Coordinators' Representative and the Executive Committee in advance of each Executive Committee meeting to determine issues of mutual concern which should be considered.  It is also anticipated that the Chair and the Coordinators' Representative would maintain regular contact to identify issues which should be addressed.  The Coordinators' Representative would act in confidentiality and would not discuss issues at the Executive Committee meeting with the Coordinator Group as a whole unless agreed upon with the Chair.

•Nine members of the EC were present at the Las Cruces EC meeting on Sunday, October 28, 2007.  They discussed the proposed policy shown above for a possible liaison position and asked clarification questions of Sharon Brandt (Wisconsin).  Eventually they held a vote and the proposal was defeated, in part because of what the EC felt were unaddressed issues. However some individual members of the Ex-Com encouraged the coordinators after the session not to let this drop but to ask for it to be brought up again at a future EC meeting.

•One of the issues expressed by the EC was whether or not a vote was taken by the coordinators as to whether they were in favor of a liaison position prior to making this request to the EC.  A vote was in fact taken at the 2007 D.C. coordinators' session to form a committee to pursue this issue with the EC, but specific numbers of votes were not recorded and it was not strictly a coordinators-only vote.  As a result, Sharon asked the group to vote again, this time specifically whether or not to continue to pursue this request with the EC.  There was a lively discussion regarding the topic at hand as well as the finalization of the language for the motion.

•Laura Stacko read the final language for the motion which was approved as follows:  Clara Kustra (New Hampshire) opened the motion which was seconded by Becky Highfill (Idaho) to proceed with the language of the ballot and proceed with the vote.  Blank ballots were distributed to everyone to begin the voting process.  Members were also requested to explain the reason for his/her vote on the ballot.

•A motion read as follows:

---

Motion:

*As a Program Coordinator of the National Space Grant Program, I support the establishment of a communication mechanism between the Executive Committee of the Space Grant Directors and the Program Coordinators.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes                          \_\_\_\_\_ No                          \_\_\_\_\_ Abstain

---

Next Steps:

•The votes will be tabulated and the tally will be reported, both to the Executive Committee and to all coordinators (see Addendum to these Minutes).  If the result of the vote is positive, Sharon will also send a letter to the Executive Committee stating that the majority of coordinators are in favor of such an idea, if that committee is willing to discuss it further.

---

## Open discussion part of session - General discussion with Diane DeTroye, Katie Pruzan, Susan Stewart, and Mark Fischer

*Due to the extended discussion regarding the liaison position to the Executive Committee, this part of the Agenda was not presented.  James apologized to NASA personnel and Mark Fischer and also extended an invitation to take a few questions from the group, but Diane DeTroye declined due to another meeting commitment.  Diane agreed to respond in writing to a list of questions that had been collected by James prior to this session, as a means of providing at least some feedback on issues we were hoping to discuss.*

James adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by:
Laura A. Stacko
Program Manager
Ohio Space Grant Consortium

***Addendum on Voting Results*** *(added after the meeting by James Flaten and Sharon Brandt)*

*Here are the results of the voting on the motion described in the minutes, as well as summary of the reasons people wrote explaining their vote. A summary of these results will also be sent to the EC with a formal request that they continue to consider this idea.*

*Vote totals for the coordinators' motion:*
*25 "Yes"*
*11 "No"*
*7 "Abstain"*

*Written explanations were provided with most of the ballots:*
*The most common reasons given for voting "yes" were (a) to improve communication between the EC and the coordinators and (b) it would be useful to have a liaison at EC meetings to give immediate feedback from the coordinator perspective regarding things they discuss.*
*The most common reason given for voting "no" was because people felt no need for such a position -- communication is adequate as is.*
*Except for one person who said they needed more information, the people who voted "abstain" did not explain their reasoning.*

# Space Grant Program Coordinators'
## Session Attendees

Las Cruces, NM – 29 Oct 2007

42 states Represented

| State | NAME(S) | State | NAME(S) |
|---|---|---|---|
| AL | Debora Nielson | MT | Glenda Winslow |
| AK | Becky Lees | NE | Melissa Wragge (Wurdeman) |
| AS | | NV | Cindy Raidl |
| AZ | | NH | Clara Fustra    Toni Galvin |
| CA | Tehseen Lazzouni | NJ | |
| CO | | NM | Judy M'Shan    Suzanna Sanchez |
| CT | Laurie Granstrand | NY | Erica Miles |
| DE | Sher Rowland Perry | NC | Jobi Cook |
| DC | Megan Kemble | ND | Sherrelle Kae Berg |
| FL | Sreela Mallick | OH | Laura Stacko |
| GA | Wanda Pierson | OK | |
| HI | Marcia Rei Sistoso | OR | Shirley Campbell |
| ID | Becky Highfill | PA | Deb Detwiler |
| IL | Diane Jeffers | PR | MAYRA W. MARTINEZ |
| IN | | RI | |
| IA | Carmen Fuchs | SC | |
| KS | LD Cory | SD | Tom Durkin |
| KY | | TN | Ellie Weiss Rosenbloom |
| LA | Karen Johnson | TX | Talia Jurgens |
| ME | Jana Hall | UT | John Vanderford |
| MD | Terry Teays | VT | Laurel Zena |
| MA | Helen Halaris | VA | CHRIS CARTER |
| MI | Bonnie Bryant | WA | |
| MN | James Flaten | WV | Candy Cardwell |
| MS | Margaret Schaff | WI | Sharon Brandt |
| MO | Stephen Haug | WY | |

AR = Arkansas - Sue Hawkins, Laura Holland