

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

- Each item should be given a rating and summarize evidence and/or concerns for each item. Current data on achievement of goals and objectives, student engagement, and budget expenditures may be included as supplemental documents provided prior to the site visit or during site visit (as separate attachments).
- PI should submit any documentation (as separate attachments) relevant to each section of the rubric.
- PI should submit a Budget (“Proposed” vs. “Actual”) for Year 4 Activities NLT 3 weeks prior to Site Visit date
- PI should submit Milestones for Year 4 planned Milestones NLT 3 week prior to Site Visit date

- Submitted Budget (“Proposed” vs. “Actual” for Year 4 Activities) NLT 3 weeks prior to Site Visit date
- Prepare a 10-minute presentation on Consortium Previous Award Past Performance Accomplishments and Success
- Invite relevant staff and personnel knowledgeable of the following: Consortium operations, Consortium DEI plans and accomplishments, budget, milestones chart, budget spreadsheets, Consortium-specific goals, outputs, outcomes, outreach strategy, performance, collaborations, participant numbers, number of student presentations, publications, patents, partnerships, and collaboration.

Institution Name		Award Number		Center Name	
Site Visit Date			Date Submitted by PI		
Assessment Rubric					

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Use this rubric to rate Year 4 performance of the Space Grant awardee for each of the categories that follow.

1-Needs Improvement	2-Meets Expectations	3-Exceeds	
<p>Awardee needs improvement in the stated criteria. Criteria is still in the planning, developing, or in the process stage. Awardee needs more guidance to further develop stated criteria.</p>	<p>Awardee provides evidence and proof of the stated criteria in question. Awardee establishes systems for stated criteria to further develop.</p>	<p>Awardee provides substantial evidence of stated criteria in question. Awardee provides evidence of developing unique and individual Consortia goals and objectives. Awardee presents evidence of NASA content being utilized, products developed, partnerships developed, collaboration across Consortia, partnerships with MSIs and. Awardee demonstrates evidence of innovation and expansion beyond initial goals and outcomes identified in the original proposal.</p>	

Section 1. Assessment of Project Activities and Accomplishments

1-Needs Improvement	2-Meets Expectations	3-Exceeds	
---------------------	----------------------	-----------	--

For each of the Space Grant Goals and Objectives, use the Assessment Rubric to rate the Year 4 performance and Year 4 performance (to date) for the awardee.

Section 1. PI Self-Assessment Criteria		Rating
1.1 Demonstrates evidence of project activities completed to date during year 4		
Evidence:		
1.2 Demonstrates evidence of project accomplishments measured against proposed goals and objectives		
Evidence:		
1.3 Demonstrates project timeline and project milestones and compares them to original plan		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
1.4 Demonstrates evidence of direct participant numbers met or exceeded S.M.A.R.T. goals		
Evidence:		
1.5 Demonstrates evidence of recruiting underrepresented and underserved students in STEM		
Evidence:		
1.6 Provides opportunities for students to engage conference presentations and submitting articles to academic journals and participation in NASA-related STEM competitions		
Evidence:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

1.7 Increases capacity to develop student knowledge and skills in NASA-related research through internships (in-state and at NASA Centers) and opportunities.

Evidence:

Total Score:

PI Self Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	7 11
Meets Expectations:	12 16
Exceeds Expectations:	17 21

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 2. Consortium Operations

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<u>Section 2. PI Self-Assessment Criteria</u>		Rating
2.1	Describes staffing levels at the lead institution and support provided by other institutions or organizations (FTEs for director, program coordinator, support staff, affiliate representatives, etc.)	
<i>Evidence:</i>		
2.2	Describes how staff resources are allocated in terms of management and administrative tasks, resource development, and/or project implementation.	
<i>Evidence:</i>		
2.3	Includes a discussion of the composition, role/purpose, and meeting frequency of Advisory/Executive Committee(s)/Boards (i.e., internal and external groups)	
<i>Evidence:</i>		
Total Score:		
PI Self Assessment Rating		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Needs Improvement:	3-5
Meets Expectations:	6-7
Exceeds Expectations:	8-9

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 3. Consortium Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plans and Accomplishments

<u>Section 3. PI Self-Assessment Criteria</u>	Rating
3.1 Evidence of knowledge of the White House Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for underserved communities through the federal government	
Evidence: <input style="width: 780px; height: 150px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
3.2 Evidence of documented partnerships and collaborations to advance DEI priorities within the state	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
3.3 Evidence of establishing policies, plans, and processes to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) priorities within the state		
Evidence:		
3.4 Evidence of documented performance metrics and target numbers to measure progress of plans/strategies to broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM		
Evidence:		
3.5 Evidence of documented plans and strategies to engage and broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM		
Evidence:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Total Score:	<input style="width: 95%;" type="text"/>
--------------	--

PI Self Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	5 9
Meets Expectations:	10 12
Exceeds Expectations:	13 15

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 4. Collaboration & Sustainability

Section 4. PI Self-Assessment Criteria		Rating
4.1 Evidence that mechanisms are in place to build partnerships that enhance the ability of the lead institution to achieve its objectives, to obtain and leverage sources of additional funding		
Evidence:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

4.2 Evidence that long-term relationships are being established/maintained to ensure that the Consortium will sustain educational programming, research activities, and utilization of research infrastructure.	
<i>Evidence:</i>	
4.3 Describes collaborations and partnerships outside the membership of the state Consortium and how they benefit the Space Grant Program	
<i>Evidence:</i>	
Total Score:	
PI Self Assessment Rating	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Needs Improvement:	3-5
Meets Expectations:	6-7
Exceeds Expectations:	8-9

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 5. Performance Management

<u>Section 5. PI Self-Assessment Criteria</u>		<u>Rating</u>
5.1 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific performance goals (i.e., Consortium-specific performance goals)		
Evidence:		
5.2 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific and Consortium-unique success criteria		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
5.3 Awardee establishes a system of documenting outcomes and demonstrating progress towards objectives and goals of Consortium		
Evidence:		
5.4 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document Consortium effectiveness or impact of cooperative agreement		
Evidence:		
5.5 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document how improvements will be implemented		
Evidence:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:	
5.7 Provides evidence of feedback from institutional staff, faculty, students, collaborators, partners and stakeholders is collected and used to improve Consortium.	
Evidence:	
Total Score:	

PI Self Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	7 11
Meets Expectations:	12 16
Exceeds Expectations:	17 21

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<u>Section 6. Budget and Reporting Compliance</u>		Rating
6.1 Provides a financial report as a spreadsheet (cumulative by year and category) with side-by-side comparison of "Budget" versus "Actual" with explanations of deviations from plan for year 4		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
6.2 Identifies the degree to which the Space Grant awardee has met budget expectations		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
6.3 Describes draw down processes		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
6.4 Confirms that current drawing down of funds is of sufficient scope and timing to meet annual spending expectations		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
6.5 Demonstrates evidence of written accounting procedures set out in an accounting manual		
Evidence:		
6.6 Demonstrates evidence that provide for current, accurate and complete disclosure of financial results		
Evidence:		
6.7 Demonstrates evidence of effectively identifying the source and use of funds		
Evidence:		
6.8 Establishes procedures to minimize the time elapsing between receipt and expenditure of funds		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
6.9 Maintains a record of cost sharing/matching contributions that are verifiable		
Evidence:		
6.10 Ensures cost sharing expenditures meet the percentage requirements in the grant agreement		
Evidence:		
6.11 Provides documentation of cost sharing expenditures meeting the percentage requirements in the grant agreement		
Evidence:		
6.12 Provides documentation of cost sharing contributions, in-kind valuations, and donations that are allowable and appropriately used		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:		
6.13 Provides evidence of expenditures being consistent with original budget		
Evidence:		
6.14 Provides required prior approvals requested and obtained before making budgetary and programmatic revisions		
Evidence:		
6.15 Demonstrates evidence of an effective system of control and accountability for funds and property		
Evidence:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Total Score:

PI Self Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement: 15 29

Meets Expectations: 30 39

Exceeds Expectations: 40 45

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 7. Areas of Achievement

Please identify any major areas of achievement and/or specific products of the Space Grant awardee. Achievements may include notable accomplishments, job performance, facilitating growth, exceeding goals or targets, solving problems, creative programming related to COVID-19, student notable achievements, faculty notable achievements, additional funding, high rate of return on investment, graduation rates, enrollment numbers, etc.

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 8. Areas of Impact

Please identify any significant areas of major impact of the Space Grant awardee including: how the work of the Consortia addresses needs of state and state-based industrial needs, process of engaging your state's stakeholders, and process of alignment to your state needs.

PI Self Assessment

Section 9. Areas of Improvement

Please identify any major areas of improvement needed by the Space Grant awardee to improve their progress toward meeting goals and objectives.

PI Self Assessment

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 10. Recommendations/Additional Comments

Please provide any recommendations, questions, or concerns. (space will expand as needed)

PI Self Assessment

Section 11. Next Steps

NASA will be reviewing the completed PI Self-Assessment and submitted documentation relevant to “Consortium operations, Consortium DEI plans and accomplishments, budget, milestones chart, budget spreadsheets, Consortium-specific goals, outputs, outcomes, outreach strategy, performance, collaborations, participant numbers, number of student presentations, publications, patents, partnerships, and collaboration” in order to assess the Consortium and prepare discussion items for the Site Visit

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Instructions for Center Specialist Review:

- Center Specialist initiates completion of this document with a self-assessment by clicking on the tables to open a fillable PDF file.
- Center Specialist will review PI self-assessment & relevant documentation submitted by PI based on Year 4 activities of the award to date
- Center Specialist will submit Center Specialist Assessment to Space Grant Management office one week prior to site visit

Center Specialist Pre-Site Visit Checklist:

- Completed PI Self-Assessment based on Year 4 activities of the award to date (submitted NLT 3 weeks prior to Site Visit date)
- Supporting documentation provided by PI including Year 4 Budget, Milestones and/or relevant documentation related to any of the following: Consortium management & operations, Consortium management strategy, budget, milestones chart, budget spreadsheets, Consortium-specific goals, outputs, outcomes, outreach strategy, performance, collaborations, participant numbers, number of student presentations, publications, patents, partnerships, and collaboration.
- Completed Center Specialist Assessment (submitted to Space Grant Management one week prior to site visit)
- Submitted Budget (“Proposed” vs. “Actual” for Year 4 activities and Milestones Year 4 planned milestones)
- During: All presentations and handouts for site visit sessions
- After Visit: Roster of all attendees and any additional documents referenced during the visit

NASA Pre-Site Visit Checklist:

NASA to provide OEPM V&V tables (submit, APR information (some information regarding Affiliate Member information can be include in Self-Assessment Rubric)

Institution Name		Award Number		Center Name	
Site Visit Date			Date Submitted by PI		
Center Specialist					
<i>Under Participation column, please identify whether Center Specialist participated in site visit in person (P), virtually (V), reviewed documents (D), or made no contributions (N).</i>					
First and Last Name		NASA Center/Employer		Title	Email
Assessment Rubric					
<i>Use this rubric to rate the Year 4 performance and Year 4 performance (to date) of the Space Grant awardee for each of the categories that follow.</i>					

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

For each of the Space Grant Goals and Objectives, use the Assessment Rubric to rate year 4 performance (to date) for the awardee.

	Rating

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:			
1.4 Demonstrates evidence of direct participant numbers met or exceeded S.M.A.R.T. goals			
Evidence:			
1.5 Demonstrates evidence of recruiting underrepresented and underserved students in STEM			
Evidence:			
1.6 Provides opportunities for students to engage conference presentations and submitting articles to academic journals and participation in NASA-related STEM competitions			
Evidence:			
1.7 Increases capacity to develop student knowledge and skills in NASA-related research through internships (in-state and at NASA Centers) and opportunities.			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:			
Total Score:			

Center Specialist Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	7 11
Meets Expectations:	12 16
Exceeds Expectations:	17 21

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 2. Consortium Operations

<u>Section 2. Center Specialist Review Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>
2.1 Describes staffing levels at the lead institution and support provided by other institutions or organizations (FTEs for director, program coordinator, support staff, affiliate representatives, etc.)	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:			
2.2 Describes how staff resources are allocated in terms of management and administrative tasks, resource development, and/or project implementation.			
Evidence:			
2.3 Includes a discussion of the composition, role/purpose, and meeting frequency of Advisory/Executive Committee(s)/Boards (i.e., internal and external groups)			
Evidence:			
Total Score:			
Center Specialist Assessment Rating			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	3-5
<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	6-7
<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	8-9

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 3. Consortium Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plans and Accomplishments

<u>Section 3. Center Specialist Review Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>
3.1 Evidence of knowledge of the White House Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for underserved communities through the federal government	
<i>Evidence:</i> <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 150px; width: 90%; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	
3.2 Evidence of documented partnerships and collaborations to advance DEI priorities within the state	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:			
3.3 Evidence of establishing policies, plans, and processes to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) priorities within the state			
Evidence:			
3.4 Evidence of documented plans and strategies to engage and broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities			
Evidence:			
3.5 Evidence of documented performance metrics to measure progress of plans/strategies to broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities			
Evidence:			
Total Score:			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Center Specialist Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	5 9
Meets Expectations:	10 12
Exceeds Expectations:	13 15

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

Section 4. Collaboration & Sustainability

<u>Section 4. Center Specialist Review Criteria</u>		Rating
4.1 Evidence that mechanisms are in place to build partnerships that enhance the ability of the lead institution to achieve its objectives, to obtain and leverage sources of additional funding		
Evidence:		
4.2 Evidence that long-term relationships are being established/maintained to ensure that the Consortium will sustain educational programming, research activities, and utilization of research infrastructure.		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:

4.3 Describes collaborations and partnerships outside the membership of the state Consortium and how they benefit the Space Grant Program

Evidence:

Total Score:

Center Specialist Assessment Rating

- Needs Improvement:** 3-5
- Meets Expectations:** 6-7
- Exceeds Expectations:** 8-9

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 5. Performance Management

Section 5. Center Specialist Review Criteria		Rating
5.1 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific performance goals (i.e., Consortium-specific performance goals)		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.2 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific and Consortium-unique success criteria		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.3 Awardee establishes a system of documenting outcomes and demonstrating progress towards objectives and goals of Consortium		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.4 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document Consortium effectiveness or impact of cooperative agreement		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.5 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document how improvements will be implemented		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.6 Awardee establishes indicators and metrics to measure outputs and outcomes		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
5.7 Provides evidence of feedback from institutional staff, faculty, students, collaborators, partners and stakeholders is collected and used to improve Consortium.		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
Total Score:		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Center Specialist Assessment Rating

<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	7 11
<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	12 16
<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	17 21

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 6. Assessment of Budget and Reporting Compliance

6.1 Provides a financial report as a spreadsheet (cumulative by year and category) with side-by-side comparison of "Budget" versus "Actual" with explanations of		
<i>Evidence:</i>		
6.2 Identifies the degree to which the Space Grant awardee has met budget expectations		

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.3 Describes draw down processes			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.4 Confirms that current drawing down of funds is of sufficient scope and timing to meet annual spending expectations			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.5 Demonstrates evidence of written accounting procedures set out in an accounting manual			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.6 Demonstrates evidence that provide for current, accurate and complete disclosure of financial results			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.7 Demonstrates evidence of effectively identifying the source and use of funds			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.8 Establishes procedures to minimize the time elapsing between receipt and expenditure of funds			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.9 Maintains a record of cost sharing/matching contributions that are verifiable			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.10 Ensures cost sharing expenditures meet the percentage requirements in the grant agreement			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.11 Provides documentation of cost sharing expenditures meeting the percentage requirements in the grant agreement			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.12 Provides documentation of cost sharing contributions, in-kind valuations, and donations that are allowable and appropriately used			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.13 Provides evidence of expenditures being consistent with original budget			
<i>Evidence:</i>			
6.14 Provides required prior approvals requested and obtained before making budgetary and programmatic revisions			

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Evidence:

6.15 Demonstrates evidence of an effective system of control and accountability for funds and property

Evidence:

Total Score:

Center Specialist Assessment Rating

Needs Improvement:	15 29
Meets Expectations:	30 39
Exceeds Expectations:	40 45

Total Score:

Rating:

Rationale for rating:

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 7. Areas of Achievement

Please identify any major areas of achievement and/or specific products of the Space Grant awardee.

Center Specialist Assessment

Section 8. Areas of Impact

Please identify any major areas of impact of the awardee including how the work of the Consortium addresses needs of the state and state-based industrial needs.

Center Specialist Assessment

Section 9. Areas of Improvement

Please identify any major areas of improvement needed by the Space Grant awardee to improve their progress toward meeting goals and objectives. (space will expand as needed)

Center Specialist Assessment

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 10. Recommendations/Additional Comments

Please provide any recommendations, questions, or concerns. (space will expand as needed)

Center Specialist Assessment

Section 11. Next Steps

NASA will be reviewing the completed PI Self-Assessment and submitted documentation relevant to “Consortium operations, Consortium DEI plans and accomplishments, budget, milestones chart, budget spreadsheets, Consortium-specific goals, outputs, outcomes, outreach strategy, performance, collaborations, participant numbers, number of student presentations, publications, patents, partnerships, and collaboration” in order to assess the Consortium and prepare discussion items for the Site Visit

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 1. Assessment of Project Activities and Accomplishments

Section 1. PI Self-Assessment Criteria	Rating	Section 1. Center Specialist Review Criteria	Rating
1.1 Demonstrates evidence of project activities completed to date during the award year		1.1 Demonstrates evidence of project activities completed to date during the award year	
1.2 Demonstrates evidence of project accomplishments measured against proposed goals and objectives		1.2 Demonstrates evidence of project accomplishments measured against proposed goals and objectives	
1.3 Demonstrates project timeline and project milestones and compares them to original plan		1.3 Demonstrates project timeline and project milestones and compares them to original plan	
1.4 Demonstrates evidence of direct participant numbers met or exceeded S.M.A.R.T. goals		1.4 Demonstrates evidence of direct participant numbers met or exceeded S.M.A.R.T. goals	
1.5 Demonstrates evidence of recruiting underrepresented and underserved students in STEM		1.5 Demonstrates evidence of recruiting underrepresented and underserved students in STEM	
1.6 Provides opportunities for students to engage conference presentations and submitting articles to academic journals and participation in NASA-related STEM competitions		1.6 Provides opportunities for students to engage in conference presentations and submitting articles to academic journals and participation in NASA-related STEM competitions	
1.7 Increases capacity to develop student knowledge and skills in NASA-related research through internships (in-state and at NASA Centers) and opportunities.		1.7 Increases capacity to develop student knowledge and skills in NASA-related research through internships (in-state and at NASA Centers) and opportunities.	
Total Score:		Total Score:	
PI Self Assessment Rating		Center Specialist Assessment Rating	
Needs Improvement:	7 11	Needs Improvement:	7 11
Meets Expectations:	12 16	Meets Expectations:	12 16
Exceeds Expectations:	17 21	Exceeds Expectations:	17 21
Total Score:		Total Score:	
Rating:		Rating:	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Rationale for rating:</i> 	<i>Rationale for rating:</i>
--	--

Section 2. Consortium Operations

Section 2. PI Self-Assessment Criteria	Rating	Section 2. Center Specialist Review Criteria	Rating
2.1 Describes staffing levels at the lead institution and support provided by other institutions or organizations (FTEs for director, program coordinator, support staff, affiliate representatives, etc.)		2.1 Describes staffing levels at the lead institution and support provided by other institutions or organizations (FTEs for director, program coordinator, support staff, affiliate representatives, etc.)	
2.2 Describes how staff resources are allocated in terms of management and administrative tasks, resource development, and/or project implementation.		2.2 Describes how staff resources are allocated in terms of management and administrative tasks, resource development, and/or project implementation.	
2.3 Includes a discussion of the composition, role/purpose, and meeting frequency of Advisory/Executive Committee(s)/Boards (i.e., internal and external groups)		2.3 Includes a discussion of the composition, role/purpose, and meeting frequency of Advisory/Executive Committee(s)/Boards (i.e., internal and external groups)	
Total Score:		Total Score:	

PI Self Assessment Rating	Center Specialist Assessment Rating
<i>Needs Improvement:</i> 3-5	<i>Needs Improvement:</i> 3-5
<i>Meets Expectations:</i> 6-7	<i>Meets Expectations:</i> 6-7
<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i> 8-9	<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i> 8-9
Total Score: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>	Total Score: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>
Rating: <input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>	Rating: <input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>

<i>Rationale for rating:</i> 	<i>Rationale for rating:</i>
--	--

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 3. Consortium Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Plans and Accomplishments

Section 3. PI Self-Assessment Criteria	Rating	Section 3. Center Specialist Review Criteria	Rating
3.1 Evidence of knowledge of the White House Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for underserved communities through the federal government		3.1 Evidence of knowledge of the White House Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for underserved communities through the federal government	
3.2 Evidence of documented partnerships and collaborations to advance DEI priorities within the state		3.2 Evidence of documented partnerships and collaborations to advance DEI priorities within the state	
3.3 Evidence of establishing policies, plans, and processes to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) priorities within the state		3.3 Evidence of establishing policies, plans, and processes to address Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) priorities within the state	
3.4 Evidence of documented plans and strategies to engage and broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities		3.4 Evidence of documented plans and strategies to engage and broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities	
3.5 Evidence of documented performance metrics to measure progress of plans/strategies to broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities		3.5 Evidence of documented performance metrics to measure progress of plans/strategies to broaden participation of students from underserved communities in STEM activities	
Total Score:		Total Score:	

PI Self Assessment Rating		Center Specialist Assessment Rating	
Needs Improvement:	5 9	Needs Improvement:	5 9
Meets Expectations:	10 12	Meets Expectations:	10 12
Exceeds Expectations:	13 15	Exceeds Expectations:	13 15
Total Score:		Total Score:	
Rating:		Rating:	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Rationale for rating:</i>	<i>Rationale for rating:</i>
------------------------------	------------------------------

Section 4. Collaboration & Sustainability

<u>Section 4. PI Self-Assessment Criteria</u>	Rating	<u>Section 4. Center Specialist Review Criteria</u>	Rating
4.1 Evidence that mechanisms are in place to build partnerships that enhance the ability of the lead institution to achieve its objectives, to obtain and leverage sources of additional funding		4.1 Evidence that mechanisms are in place to build partnerships that enhance the ability of the lead institution to achieve its objectives, to obtain and leverage sources of additional funding	
4.2 Evidence that long-term relationships are being established/maintained to ensure that the Consortium will sustain educational programming, research activities, and utilization of research infrastructure.		4.2 Evidence that long-term relationships are being established/maintained to ensure that the Consortium will sustain educational programming, research activities, and utilization of research infrastructure.	
4.3 Describes collaborations and partnerships outside the membership of the state Consortium and how they benefit the Space Grant Program		4.3 Describes collaborations and partnerships outside the membership of the state Consortium and how they benefit the Space Grant Program	
Total Score:		Total Score:	

PI Self Assessment Rating		Center Specialist Assessment Rating	
<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	3 5	<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	3 5
<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	6-7	<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	6-7
<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	8-9	<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	8-9
Total Score:	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>	Total Score:	<input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>
Rating:	<input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>	Rating:	<input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Rationale for rating:</i>	<i>Rationale for rating:</i>
------------------------------	------------------------------

Section 5. Performance Management

Section 5. PI Self-Assessment Criteria	Rating	Section 5. Center Specialist Review Criteria	Rating
5.1 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific performance goals (i.e., Consortium-specific performance goals)		5.1 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific performance goals (i.e., Consortium-specific performance goals)	
5.2 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific and Consortium-unique success criteria		5.2 Awardee provides evidence of developing site-specific and Consortium-unique success criteria	
5.3 Awardee establishes a system of documenting outcomes and demonstrating progress towards objectives and goals of Consortium		5.3 Awardee establishes a system of documenting outcomes and demonstrating progress towards objectives and goals of Consortium	
5.4 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document Consortium effectiveness or impact of cooperative agreement		5.4 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document Consortium effectiveness or impact of cooperative agreement	
5.5 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document how improvements will be implemented		5.5 Awardee demonstrates evidence of establishing a process to document how improvements will be implemented	
5.6 Awardee establishes indicators and metrics to measure outputs and outcomes		5.6 Awardee establishes indicators and metrics to measure outputs and outcomes	
5.7 Provides evidence of feedback from institutional staff, faculty, students, collaborators, partners and stakeholders is collected and used to improve Consortium.		5.7 Provides evidence of feedback from institutional staff, faculty, students, collaborators, partners and stakeholders is collected and used to improve Consortium.	
Total Score:		Total Score:	

PI Self Assessment Rating		Center Specialist Assessment Rating	
<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	7 11	<i>Needs Improvement:</i>	7 11
<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	12 16	<i>Meets Expectations:</i>	12 16
<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	17 21	<i>Exceeds Expectations:</i>	17 21

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<p>Total Score: <input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Rating: <input style="width: 180px; height: 25px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Rationale for rating:</p>	<p>Total Score: <input style="width: 80px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Rating: <input style="width: 180px; height: 25px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Rationale for rating:</p>
---	---

Section 6. Assessment of Budget and Reporting Compliance

<u>Section 6. PI Self-Assessment Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Section 6. Center Specialist Review Criteria</u>	<u>Rating</u>
6.1 Provides a financial report as a spreadsheet (cumulative by year and category) with side-by-side comparison of “Budget” versus “Actual” with explanations of deviations from plan	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.1 Provides a financial report as a spreadsheet (cumulative by year and category) with side-by-side comparison of “Budget” versus “Actual” with explanations of deviations from plan	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.2 Identifies the degree to which the Space Grant awardee has met budget expectations	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.2 Identifies the degree to which the Space Grant awardee has met budget expectations	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.3 Describes draw down processes	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.3 Describes draw down processes	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.4 Confirms that current drawing down of funds is of sufficient scope and timing to meet annual spending expectations	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.4 Confirms that current drawing down of funds is of sufficient scope and timing to meet annual spending expectations	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.5 Demonstrates evidence of written accounting procedures set out in an accounting manual	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.5 Demonstrates evidence of written accounting procedures set out in an accounting manual	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.6 Demonstrates evidence that provide for current, accurate and complete disclosure of financial results	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.6 Demonstrates evidence that provide for current, accurate and complete disclosure of financial results	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
6.7 Demonstrates evidence of effectively identifying the source and use of	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	6.7 Demonstrates evidence of effectively identifying the source and use of	<input style="width: 20px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

funds		funds	
6.8 Establishes procedures to minimize the time elapsing between receipt and expenditure of funds	<input type="text"/>	6.8 Establishes procedures to minimize the time elapsing between receipt and expenditure of funds	<input type="text"/>
6.9 Maintains a record of cost sharing/matching contributions that are verifiable	<input type="text"/>	6.9 Maintains a record of cost sharing/matching contributions that are verifiable	<input type="text"/>
6.10 Ensures cost sharing expenditures meet the percentage requirements in the grant agreement	<input type="text"/>	6.10 Ensures cost sharing expenditures meet the percentage requirements in the grant agreement	<input type="text"/>
6.11 Provides documentation of cost sharing expenditures meeting the percentage requirements in the grant agreement	<input type="text"/>	6.11 Provides documentation of cost sharing expenditures meeting the percentage requirements in the grant agreement	<input type="text"/>
6.12 Provides documentation of cost sharing contributions, in-kind valuations, and donations that are allowable and appropriately used	<input type="text"/>	6.12 Provides documentation of cost sharing contributions, in-kind valuations, and donations that are allowable and appropriately used	<input type="text"/>
6.13 Provides evidence of expenditures being consistent with original budget	<input type="text"/>	6.13 Provides evidence of expenditures being consistent with original budget	<input type="text"/>
6.14 Provides required prior approvals requested and obtained before making budgetary and programmatic revisions	<input type="text"/>	6.14 Provides required prior approvals requested and obtained before making budgetary and programmatic revisions	<input type="text"/>
6.15 Demonstrates evidence of an effective system of control and accountability for funds and property	<input type="text"/>	6.15 Demonstrates evidence of an effective system of control and accountability for funds and property	<input type="text"/>
Total Score:	<input type="text"/>	Total Score:	<input type="text"/>

PI Self Assessment Rating		Center Specialist Assessment Rating	
Needs Improvement:	15 29	Needs Improvement:	15 29
Meets Expectations:	30 39	Meets Expectations:	30 39
Exceeds Expectations:	40 45	Exceeds Expectations:	40 45
Total Score: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>		Total Score: <input style="width: 80px;" type="text"/>	
Rating: <input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>		Rating: <input style="width: 180px;" type="text"/>	

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

<i>Rationale for rating:</i>	<i>Rationale for rating:</i>
------------------------------	------------------------------

Section 7. Areas of Achievement

Please identify any major areas of achievement and/or specific products of the Space Grant awardee. Achievements may also include the following:

- Consortium achievements in response to the COVID-19 pandemic
- Consortium's resiliency to the COVID-19 pandemic

PI Self Assessment	Center Specialist Assessment
--------------------	------------------------------

--	--

Section 8. Areas of Impact

Please identify any significant areas of major impact of the Space Grant awardee including how the work of the Consortium addresses needs of the state and state-based industrial needs.

PI Self Assessment	Center Specialist Assessment
--------------------	------------------------------

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 9. Areas of Improvement

Please identify any major areas of improvement needed by the Space Grant awardee to improve their progress toward meeting goals and objectives. (space will expand as needed)

PI Self Assessment

Center Specialist Assessment

Section 10. Recommendations/Additional Comments

Please provide any recommendations, questions, or concerns. (space will expand as needed)

PI Self Assessment

Center Specialist Assessment

SPACE GRANT CONSORTIUM SITE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Section 11. Space Grant Management Team Feedback

NASA Space Grant Management will be reviewing the completed PI Self-Assessment and submitted documentation and Center Specialist Review in order to assess the Consortium and prepare discussion during the site visit. Additional feedback and relevant input will be entered in the section below and discussed during the site visit.