

20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation (2003-2007)

Affiliate Survey Results

Kentucky Space Grant Consortium Grant Type: Designated

March 2009

**Prepared by:** 

Kelly M. Hannum, Ph.D. Evaluation Consultant

**Diane D. DeTroye Katherine M. Pruzan** NASA Headquarters, Office of Education



This document contains pre-decisional, sensitive or unclassified proprietary information and/or contains other non-public information. Recipients are not authorized to forward this information to individuals not having a "need to know" within NASA, or to persons outside NASA, without the express written consent of the sender.



# Introduction

The National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program is a national network of colleges and universities working to expand opportunities for Americans to understand and participate in NASA's aeronautics and space programs by supporting and enhancing science and engineering education, research, and outreach programs. The program promotes partnerships and cooperation among universities, federal, state, and local governments, and industry to encourage and facilitate the application of university resources to aerospace and related fields. Below are the specific objectives of the program with the related operating principles from the Office of Education's *Strategic Coordination Framework: A Portfolio Approach* (available at: <u>http://education.nasa.gov/about/strategy/index</u>) in parentheses:

- Establish and maintain a national network of universities (Partnership/Sustainability).
- Encourage cooperative programs among universities, aerospace industry, and federal, state, and local governments (Relevance).
- Encourage interdisciplinary education, research, and public-service programs related to aerospace (Content).
- Recruit and train U.S. citizens, especially women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities (Diversity).
- Promote a strong science, mathematics, and technology education base from elementary through secondary levels (Pipeline/Continuity).

The 20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation is designed to assess the effectiveness of the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program. An evaluation is required every five years in order to provide information that assists with the following:

- Demonstrating to NASA's constituents and stakeholders the impact and overall merit of the Space Grant Program in each state as well as the overall benefit to the Agency in terms of the Office of Education Outcomes I, II, and III.
- Making informed decisions about future allocations of Space Grant resources.

The three outcomes set forth by the Office of Education are intended to align agency education activities related to inspiring, engaging, educating, and employing toward the following outcomes:

- I. Contribute to the development of the STEM workforce in disciplines needed to achieve NASA's strategic goals through portfolio investments
- II. Attract and retain students in STEM disciplines through a progression of educational opportunities for students, teachers, and faculty.
- III. Build strategic partnerships and linkages between STEM formal and informal education providers that promote STEM literacy and awareness of NASA's mission.

The 20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation contains three components: (1) Program Performance and Results; (2) Network Participation and Responsiveness; and (3) the Affiliate Survey. Data from these three elements are combined to demonstrate the merit and benefits of the program and to improve decision making associated with program.

The affiliate members' opinions represent a critical component of the program, and therefore the Affiliate Survey is a critical element of the  $20^{th}$  Year Evaluation. This report summarizes the results of the Affiliate Survey at the consortium level.

#### **Description of Survey & Survey Administration**

NASA Headquarters staff and representatives of Western Michigan University first developed and administered the affiliate survey as part of the 15<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation in 2003. The 20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation survey is based on the previous version. The majority of the survey remained the same, allowing comparisons of data from the 15<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation and 20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation. A copy of the survey is included in the Appendices.

The twenty-eight item web-based survey measured affiliate's knowledge of, satisfaction with, and participation in the program as well as program emphasis and impact. The survey contained the following sections: Affiliate Demographics; Consortium Goals and Objectives; Space Grant Funds; Consortium Fellowship and Scholarship Program; Consortium Communication and Interaction; Consortium Leadership; Program Impact; and NASA and National Space Grant Program Information. The majority of items used a four point Likert-type response option. The survey could be completed in approximately 20 minutes.

An invitation to participate in the survey was sent via email to affiliate representatives listed in the Consortium Management Information System as of March 17, 2008 (see Description of Sample for additional information). The invitation included responses to frequently asked questions and a link to the survey itself. The day after the email invitations were sent, a telephone voice mail was broadcast to all Affiliate Representatives informing them they should have received the email invitation, reminding them of the importance of completing the survey, and providing them with contact information in case they had not yet received the email invitation. Incorrect email addresses required follow-up action by the survey administrator to ensure all affiliates had the opportunity to participate. In addition, an email was sent from the Program Manager to all Program Directors and Coordinators. Two reminder emails were sent at one week intervals to encourage participation among nonrespondents. Non-respondents were contacted by personal emails and phone calls and an email request was sent to the Directors and Coordinators of consortia with low levels of response to forward an email reminding affiliate representatives to complete the survey. Where appropriate, surveys were printed and faxed and/or an alternate link to the survey was provided.

## Description of National Sample

A total of 779 surveys were distributed to affiliate representatives located in all fifty-one geographic regions (including Puerto Rico and Washington D.C.). Eleven (11) contacts indicated they were no longer associated with the Space Grant, reducing the total number of potential respondents to 768. Of the 768 potential respondents, 652 valid surveys were completed. The resulting mean response rate was 85%. The response rate for the fifty-one consortia ranged from 62% to 100%.

#### Description of State Sample

The response rate for this state was 100% (14 surveys administered and 14 completed). In general, the closer the response rate is to 100% the more likely it is that responses are representative of affiliate representatives from that consortium. By comparing the state results to the national results, provided previously, one can get a sense of how typical the consortium level response rate in light of national results. The survey was voluntary.

# Results

The following sections provide a summary of survey results. The overall section provides a summary of affiliate members' knowledge of, satisfaction with, and participation in the program as well as information about program emphasis and program impact. Subsequent sections provide an overview of information in the following areas: Consortium Goals and Objectives; Space Grant Funds; Consortium Fellowship and Scholarship Program; Consortium Communication; Consortium Leadership; Program Impact; and NASA and National Space Grant Program Information.

Survey respondents were provided with an opportunity to comment as part of the survey. Because respondents were assured that their responses would remain confidential, verbatim responses to open-ended questions are not typically shared in this report. In some instances, direct quotes are provided, but the respondents' identities remain anonymous. As appropriate, a summary of respondent comments or themes is included in each section of this report. Demographic data such as affiliate type, lengths of service, etc. are not included in this report because in cases where the number of people responding to the survey was small, it may be possible to identify who responded to the survey.

#### Overall

Results are presented by survey categories in the following sections. Survey questions were grouped into five categories to produce summary results. The means illustrated in the following graph are based on a four-point scale, with higher ratings preferred. Means were calculated using all responses. In order not to skew the mean ratings, items rated as "not applicable" were coded as missing. Affiliate ratings are compared to the mean of ratings from the same grant type. For the purposes of longitudinal comparison, the state-level 2003 results summary data are presented along with the overall 2008 data. Longitudinal data are not included in the remaining sections of this report. On all graphs, the blue bar indicates the 2008 state mean and the yellow bar indicates the 2008 mean for the associated grant type.



**Results Summary** 

#### **Consortium Goals and Objectives**

This survey section provides affiliate members' opinions regarding the content and development of the goals and objectives of your consortium, as well as their role in that process. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from comments regarding your consortium's goals and objectives are shared at the end of this section.



#### **Consortium Goals & Objectives**

## Comments

- Though I did not specifically participate in the development of the goals, I agree with them and had ample opportunity to contribute.
- Goals are clear and well understood.

#### Space Grant Funds

This survey section provides affiliate members' opinions regarding the manner in which the Space Grant funds are managed and distributed in your consortium, as well as their role in the process. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.



One respondent expressed concern regarding the timeliness of payments.

#### **Consortium Fellowship and Scholarship Program**

This survey section provides affiliate members' opinions regarding Space Grant fellowship and scholarship program; this includes graduate and/or undergraduate awards within your consortium. the as well as their role in the process (e.g. recruitment, application, selection process, and award distribution). Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.



#### **Consortium Fellowship & Scholarship Program**

#### Comments

- This is a difficult job to supervise, but I think our people do a fine job of this. All member institutions are kept in the loop and communication lines are well-maintained.
- Some reps don't do as well at publicizing the grants and fellowships within their institutions.
- I would be more satisfied with results if our percentage of awards to women, etc., were higher. I think that we do well to fund qualified individuals in this area. The problem is that we do not receive enough qualified applicants.
- Changes have been made recently to make things better. The organization listened to its members.

### **Consortium Communication and Interaction**

This survey section provides an overview of affiliate members' opinions regarding the frequency, content, and quality of communication within the consortium. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.



#### **Consortium Communication**

#### Comments

- Close; maybe we could use a bit more.
- Web site could be improved. Applicants report to me they have trouble navigating it, and it is not a "clean" design.
- Solid communication strategy.
- This does not seem to be a priority with our current Director, although there has been some improvement recently with the addition of staff.
- Wish members in the organization had better ways to interact outside of management meetings.

## **Frequency of Consortium Communication**

The table below indicates the percentage of respondents selecting each of the options on the left. Data are provided for the state and the appropriate grant type for comparison. Data may not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) all survey respondents may not have replied to each question, and (2) rounding error.

My consortium communicates	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Too often	2%	0%
The right amount	84%	79%
Not enough	13%	21%
Never	1%	0%

## Consortium Leadership

This survey section provides an overview of affiliate members' opinions regarding the Consortium Director and his/her leadership role. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.



**Consortium Leadership** 

Comments are mixed – concerns about communication, timeliness, meeting preparation, and concerns about possible barriers for the director from university management personnel.

## Sharing of the 15th Year Review Results

The table below indicates the percentage of respondents selecting each of the options on the left. Data are provided for the state and the appropriate grant type for comparison. Data may not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) all survey respondents may not have replied to each question, and (2) rounding error.

The Director shared with me (or my predecessor) the results of the 15th Year Evaluation for our consortium.	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Yes	56%	50%
No	10%	21%
Not Sure	34%	29%

The results of the 15th Year Evaluation were used to make changes and/or improvements within the consortium	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Yes	52%	50%
No	1%	0%
Not Sure	47%	50%

### **Recommendation for Director Continuing in this Leadership Position**

The table below indicates the percentage of respondents selecting each of the options on the left. Data are provided for the state and the appropriate grant type for comparison. Data may not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) all survey respondents may not have replied to each question, and (2) rounding error.

I recommend that the Director continue in this leadership position	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Yes	89%	86%
No	2%	0%
Not Sure	9%	14%

A change in leadership was experienced within the last five years; below are responses related to that change. Comparative data are not available since not all consortia experienced a change in Director.

My Consortium experienced a change of Director or leadership during the past five years?	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Yes	93%
No	7%
Not Sure	0%
I am satisfied with the process by which the new Director of leadership was selected	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Yes	57%
No	14%
NA	29%

Comments regarding Leadership Change

- The statewide committee recommended the person to serve as the new director.
- I have no problems with the director. However, the director was not allowed to choose her Associate Program Director.

## **Program Impact**

This survey section provides affiliate members' opinions regarding the impact of Space Grant on their institutions or organizations as well as within the state. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.



**Program Impact** 

Comments indicate primary benefits to undergraduate and graduate students, faculty research infrastructure, and state regional universities.

## Specific Comments

- The consortium has funded numerous research projects on the part of state faculty and students. It has enabled people to get into new space-related areas of research, and has had a strong impact on undergraduate research. Likewise, it has enabled us to give strong publicity to space-related events and issues.
- Space Grant plays significant leadership role in Kentucky. They are not "followers' but risk takers and leaders...that make a difference.
- KSGC has had a very positive impact on our university. Over the years it has supported faculty and student research, funding for undergraduates and graduate students, and support for workshops. In many instances funding received from KSGC has acted as seed for future grants. As an institution we are most grateful for the opportunity to participate.

- Space Grant is a player in other Kentucky NASA oriented programs, such as KYSAT and KY EPSCoR.
- Space Grant has had a significant positive affect on space-related R&D in Kentucky. There is significant research talent at the regional universities which Space Grants often supports. These researchers have experience, knowledge and skills to contribute to research and design that is directly relevant to the NASA mission. Space Grant serves as a critical catalyst to start and to promote these activities.
- Space Grant has had a big impact on our institution.

## NASA and National Space Grant Program Information

This final survey section provides affiliate members' opinions regarding the information received about NASA and the National Space Grant Program; including the nature, frequency and value of information. Responses are based on affiliate members' experiences with the program over the past five years. Any themes from the comments are shared at the end of this section.

The table below indicates the percentage of respondents selecting each of the options on the left. Data are provided for the state and the appropriate grant type for comparison. Data may not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) all survey respondents may not have replied to each question, and (2) rounding error.

I receive information about NASA opportunities (e.g. student involvement, faculty enhancement, and research) from the consortium leadership	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Frequently	74%	71%
Sometimes	25%	21%
Never	1%	7%

The table below indicates the percentage of respondents selecting each of the options on the left. Data are provided for the state and the appropriate grant type for comparison. Data may not add to 100% for two reasons: (1) all survey respondents may not have replied to each question, and (2) rounding error.

I receive information regarding the policies and directions of the National Space Grant Program from the consortium leadership	All Designated Program Respondents (N=488)	Kentucky 2008 (N=14)
Frequently	53%	50%
Sometimes	43%	43%
Never	4%	7%

## Comments

- My state is one in which there are no NASA facilities and technological development as a whole has lagged. The Space Grant program has made connections between faculty and students from my state and personnel at NASA centers, resulting in some excellent research projects. I cannot over-estimate its impact here!
- The National Space Grant Program has been critical to the development and support of space-related R&D in Kentucky. The Space Grant program has helped to initiate new lines of research and support existing research relevant to the NASA mission, often when

state and other federal support for these projects was limited. Young faculty and students have especially benefitted from the Space Grant program which serves to perpetuate important space-related research in Kentucky.

• I think that this is a valuable program that helps develop relationships between NASA and Industries via Universities. Keep up the good work.

# Conclusion

This overview of survey results provides information about affiliate's knowledge of, satisfaction with, participation in the program as well as program emphasis and impact. The information reported here will be used in conjunction with Program Performance and Results and Network Participation and Responsiveness components of the 20<sup>th</sup> Year Evaluation of the National Space Grant College and Fellowship Program.

# **APPENDICES**

# **APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF SCALES**

## Items on Scales

Below the text of all the items associated with each scale is shared.

## Knowledge

- I know the goals & objectives of my consortium
- I know how Space Grant Funds are distributed within my consortium
- The application process for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships is clearly communicated to eligible applicants within my consortium
- My consortium seeks opportunities for the affiliate members to interact with one another

## Satisfaction

- I am satisfied with the goals & objectives of my consortium
- I am satisfied with the process by which the current goals & objectives were developed for my consortium
- I am satisfied with how decisions are made regarding the distribution of Space Grant funds within my consortium
- Overall, I am satisfied with the recruitment process used for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships
- Overall, I am satisfied with the selection process used for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships within my consortium
- I am satisfied with the distribution of awards across the consortium
- I am satisfied with the results of my consortium in terms of the awards to women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities
- I am satisfied with the content of consortium communication (e.g. face-toface meetings, annual symposium, conference calls, electronic)
- I am satisfied with the frequency of consortium communication (e.g. faceto-face meetings, annual symposium, conference calls, electronic)
- I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among the affiliates members within my consortium.
- The Director effectively manages the consortium
- The Director manages the consortium with integrity
- I have a collegial working relationship with the Director
- I am comfortable raising issues and concerns regarding the consortium with the Director
- The Director works to resolve issues and concerns in a professional manner
- I recommend that the Director continue in this leadership position.

## Participation

- I (or my predecessor) had the opportunity to be involved in developing the current goals & objectives of my consortium
- I participated in the development of the current goals & objectives of my consortium
- I am included in the decision-making process regarding the use of Space Grant funds within my consortium
- As the affiliate representative, I am included in the selection process regarding Space Grant fellowship and scholarship awards within my consortium

# Emphasis

- The current goals & objectives of my consortium are derived from the needs within my state and NASA's priorities
- My consortium seeks participation of women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities in our Space Grant programs and activities
- My consortium seeks opportunities for meaningful engagement of Minority Serving Institutions in consortium projects and activities
- Decisions regarding the distribution of Space Grant funds are based on identified needs (e.g. education, economic development, science & technology, etc.) within my state
- Students from all academic affiliates within my consortium are eligible to apply for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships
- Space Grant fellowship and scholarship opportunities are widely publicized throughout my consortium
- My consortium seeks applications from women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities for Space Grant fellowships and scholarship
- Continuous improvement is practiced by the consortium leadership

## Impact

- My consortium has had a positive impact in my state
- Membership in this consortium has had a positive impact on my institution/organization

## Scale Reliability

The Cronbach's Alpha estimates of scales ranged from 0.76 to 0.93. The closer to 1.0 the better the scale is at measuring a single construct. Generally speaking alphas above 0.70 are considered acceptable. Typically scales with more items exhibit higher reliability estimates, so it is not surprising that the Satisfaction scale has the highest reliability estimate; it has far more items than do the other scales.

Scale	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Knowledge	4	0.76
Satisfaction	16	0.93
Participation	4	0.82
Emphasis	8	0.89
Impact	2	0.81

# APPENDIX B: AFFLIATE SURVEY

# 1. Affiliate Demographics

This first section will be used to analyze data by affiliate type, special attributes, and individual tenure with the program. These data will not be used as a means to identify the respondent nor will they be shared with the consortium Director.

1. \*Of which state consortium are you a member?

	State:	<b>•</b>
	Puerto Rico:	
*	2. Please indicate	your affiliate type.
	jn University/College	
	jŋ Community/Junior Colle	ege
	jn State/Local Governmen	t
	🕥 Other/Federal Governm	ent

- in Industry
- Nonprofit Organization
- Museum/Science Center
- Other (please specify)

\* 3. Please note any special attributes/classifications. Mark all that apply.

- Historically Black College/University
- Hispanic Serving Institution
- Tribal College/University
- Other Minority University
- Minority Focused Organization
- None of the Above

\* 4. How long have you personally been associated with the Space Grant consortium?

- here Less than one year
- in 1-4 years
- m 5-10 years
- More than 10 years

- \* 5. Did you participate in the NASA Space Grant College and Fellowship Program Affiliate Survey during the 15th Year Evaluation conducted in May, 2003?
  - jn Yes
  - jn No
  - jn Not Sure

# 2. Consortium Goals and Objectives

The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion regarding the content and development of the goals and objectives of your consortium, as well as your role in this process. Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments regarding your consortium goals and objectives.

# \* 6. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. Select the N/A option for statements that are not applicable to your situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I know the goals & objectives of my consortium.	ja	pt	ja	ρť	ja
I am satisfied with the goals and objectives of my consortium.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
I (or my predecessor) had the opportunity to be involved in developing the current goals and objectives of my consortium.	jo	ja	ρί	ja	ja
I participated in the development of the current goals & objectives of my consortium.	jm	jn	j'n	jn	jm
I am satisfied with the process by which the current goals and objectives were developed for my consortium.	jo	ja	ρţ	ja	ja
The current goals and objectives of my consortium are derived from the needs within my state and NASA's priorities.	jn	jn	ju	jn	Jn
My consortium seeks participation of women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities in our Space Grant programs and activities.	ja	<b>j</b> a	ja	ja	ja
My consortium seeks opportunities for meaningful engagement of Minority Serving Institutions in consortium projects and activities.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

7. Please provide any comments you have regarding the goals and objectives of your consortium.



# 3. Space Grant Funds

The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion regarding the manner in which the Space Grant funds are managed and distributed in your consortium, as well as your role in the process. Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments regarding the management and distribution of Space Grant funds within your consortium.

# \* 8. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the next four statements. Select the N/A option for statements that are not applicable to your situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I know how Space Grant Funds are distributed within my consortium.	ja	ja	ja	jo	ja
Decisions regarding the distribution of Space Grant funds are based on identified needs (e.g., education, economic development, science & technology, etc.) within my state.	jn	jņ	jn	j'n	່ງກ
I am included in the decision-making process regarding the use of Space Grant funds within my consortium.	ja	pt	ρţ	j'n	ja
I am satisfied with how decisions are made regarding the distribution of Space Grant funds within my consortium.	jn	jņ	ju	j'n	jn

9. Please provide any comments you have regarding the management and distribution of Space Grant funds within your consortium.

# 4. Consortium Fellowship and Scholarship Program

The following statements relate to the Space Grant fellowship and scholarship program; this includes graduate and/or undergraduate awards within your consortium. The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion regarding some of the basic elements of a Space Grant fellowship and scholarship program and your role in the process (e.g. recruitment, application, selection process, and award distribution). Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments regarding the consortium fellowship and scholarship program.

# \* 10. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. Select the N/A option for statements that are not applicable to your situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
Students from all academic affiliates within my consortium are eligible to apply for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships.	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
Space Grant fellowship and scholarship opportunities are widely publicized throughout my consortium.	jn	j'n	jn	ĴΩ	jn
Overall, I am satisfied with the recruitment process used for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships.	ja	j'n	ja	ja	ja
My consortium seeks applications from women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
The application process for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships is clearly communicated to eligible applicants within my consortium.	ja	<b>j</b> n	ja	ja	ja
As the affiliate representative, I am included in the selection process regarding Space Grant fellowship and scholarship awards within my consortium.	jn	j'n	Jn	<b>j</b> î	jn
Overall, I am satisfied with the selection process used for Space Grant fellowships and scholarships within my consortium.	ja	j:0	ja	ja	ja
I am satisfied with the distribution of awards across the consortium.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn
I am satisfied with the results of my consortium in terms of the awards to women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities.	ja	jo	ja	ja	ja

11. Please provide any comments you have regarding Space Grant fellowship and scholarship eligibility, application, or distribution of awards within your consortium.



# 5. Consortium Communication and Interaction

The purpose of this section is to understand your opinion regarding the frequency, content, and quality of communication within the consortium. Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments you have regarding communication within your consortium.

## \* 12. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
I am satisfied with the content of consortium communication (e.g. face-to-face meetings, annual symposium, conference calls, electronic).	ja	ρţ	ρţ	jn	ţα
I am satisfied with the frequency of consortium communication (e.g. face-to-face meetings, annual symposium, conference calls, electronic).	jn	jņ	jn	jm	ju
My consortium seeks opportunities for the affiliate members to interact with one another.	ja	ja	jo	jn	ja
I am satisfied with the amount of interaction among the affiliate members within my consortium.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

#### \* 13. My consortium communicates

- Too often
- in The right amount
- jn Not enough
- n Never

14. Please provide any comments you have regarding communication and/or interaction within your consortium.



# 6. Consortium Leadership

The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion regarding the Consortium Director and his/her leadership role. Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments regarding the leadership of your consortium.

- \* 15. My consortium experienced a change of Director or leadership during the past five years.
  - n Yes
  - jn No
  - n Not Sure
- \* 16. I am satisfied with the process by which the new Director or leadership was selected.
  - jn Yes
  - in No
  - in N/A

Please provide any comments you have regarding the selection process.

\* 17. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. Select the N/A option for statements that are not applicable to your situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
The Director effectively manages the consortium.	ja	ja	ja	<b>j</b> ta	ja
The Director manages the consortium with integrity.	jn	jn	jn	j'n	jn
I have a collegial working relationship with the Director.	ja	ja	pt	jn	ζΩ
I am comfortable raising issues and concerns regarding the consortium with the Director.	jn	jn	jn	jn	Ĵ
The Director works to resolve issues and concerns in a professional manner.	ja	ja	ρţ	jn	ζn
Continuous improvement is practiced by the consortium leadership.	jn	jn	jn	jn	jn

\* 18. The Director shared with me (or my predecessor) the results of the 15th Year Evaluation for our consortium.

- m Yes
- jn No

n Not Sure

- \* 19. The results of the 15th Year Evaluation were used to make changes and/or improvements within the consortium.
  - jn Yes
  - jn No
  - jn Not Sure
- $\star$  20. I recommend that the Director continue in this leadership position.
  - jn Yes
  - jn No
  - jn Not Sure

21. Please provide any comments you have regarding the leadership of your consortium.

	-	
		1

## 7. Program Impact

The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion regarding the impact of Space Grant in your state and on your institution/organization. Your responses should be based on your experiences with the program over the past five years. There is an opportunity to provide any comments regarding the impact of the Space Grant Program.

\* 22. Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements. Select the N/A option for statements that are not applicable to your situation.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A
My Consortium has had a positive impact in my state.	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja
Membership in this Consortium has had a positive impact on my institution/organization.	jn	jn	J'n	jn	jn

23. Please provide any anecdote regarding the of impact of your consortium at the state and/or institutional level.



24. Please provide any comments you have regarding the impact of Space Grant in your state or on your institution/organization.



# 8. NASA and National Space Grant Program Information

The final section relates to information you receive about NASA and the National Space Grant Program. The purpose of this section is to obtain your opinion concerning the nature, frequency and value of information you may have received during the last five years. There is an opportunity at the end of this section for you to provide any comments regarding NASA and the National Space Grant Program.

\* 25. I receive information about NASA opportunities (e.g. student involvement, faculty enhancement, and research) from the consortium leadership.

- jn Frequently
- 5 Sometimes
- jn Never
- \* 26. I receive information regarding the policies and directions of the National Space Grant Program from the consortium leadership.
  - jn Frequently
  - jn Sometimes
  - jn Never

27. Please provide any comments or recommendations you have regarding NASA and the National Space Grant Program.

28. Please provide any additional comments, including recommendations you have regarding future surveys.

