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Section 1. Executive Summary

1.1 Overview
From March 2011 to April 2011, SmartStart Educational Consulting Services conducted a formative evaluation of the NSF Nevada EPSCoR project. The focus of this quarter’s evaluation is to identify activities that are being conducted and to assess the quality of those activities and the evaluation forms that are being used to evaluate them. The evaluation will also progress towards assessment of impact on project participants based on project goals. The primary goals of the Nevada EPSCoR project are:

Goal 1 - Climate Modeling
Goal 2 - Ecological Change
Goal 3 - Water Resources
Goal 4 - Policy, Decision Making and Outreach
Goal 5 - Cyberinfrastructure
Goal 6 - Education
Goal 7 - Small Business Innovation Research
Goal 8 - Project Integration and Synergy

The following EPSCoR activities were conducted between September 1, 2010 and May 20, 2011. Evaluation results and/or evaluation forms of these project components are included in this Quarter 2 report:

- Annual Nevada Climate Change Conference
- Climate Change Seminar Series
- Annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium
- Incorporation of findings of the External Research and Technical Advisory Board (ERTAB) into the evaluation
- Development of Data Portal survey
- Development of Technical Writing Assistance survey

1.2 Findings
Based on the results of the three components evaluated during quarter 2, the Track 1 EPSCoR project is doing and excellent job meeting the needs of project participants. All project activities were rated very highly. Faculty, students, and the general public who participated in project activities made useful suggestions. The evaluator made specific recommendations related to each activity that should be considered for implementation. Additionally, standardize collection of demographic information across the Track 1 EPSCoR project. Align demographic questions with NSF reporting requirements. Align evaluation forms with program agendas and include questions pertaining to achievement of project goals, the impact participation in the meeting had on participants, and how they will apply what they have learned. Participants in these project activities are primarily male and Caucasian or Asian. Continue to work towards involving more females and underrepresented minorities in this EPSCoR project and activities. Advertise and publicize activities and events more widely and make a greater effort to personally invite individuals from underrepresented groups to get involved.
Section 2. Introduction

2.1 Background
This Nevada EPSCoR National Science Foundation project was designed to stimulate research, education, and outreach centered on the effects of regional climate change on ecosystem resources. The mission of this Nevada Infrastructure for Climate Change Science, Education, and Outreach project is to build Nevada’s capacity to model regional climate change, evaluate methods to downscale model output, understand and quantify key ecological and hydrological processes, translate climate change science into formats usable by decision-makers, integrate models and data, and improve how students learn about climate change.

Nevada’s vision for this project is stated in the Five year Strategic Plan (2/20/2009, page i) is:

To create a statewide interdisciplinary program and virtual climate change center that will stimulate transformative research, education, and outreach on the effects of regional climate change on ecosystem resources (especially water) and support use of this knowledge by policy makers and stakeholders.

The primary goals of the Nevada Track 1 EPSCoR project are:

**Goal 1 - Climate Modeling:**
Promote climate change scientific discovery by carrying out nationally competitive collaborative capacity building in climate modeling.

**Goal 2 - Ecological Change:**
Promote climate change scientific discovery by carrying out nationally competitive collaborative capacity building in ecological change.

**Goal 3 - Water Resources:**
Promote climate change scientific discovery by carrying out nationally competitive collaborative capacity building in water resources.

**Goal 4 - Policy, Decision Making and Outreach:**
Enable researchers to document, interpret, and communicate institutional and societal impacts of the project’s climate change research findings to all interested and affected parties including decision-makers, businesses, educators, and the public.

**Goal 5 - Cyberinfrastructure:**
Facilitate and support interdisciplinary climate change research, policy, decision-making, outreach, and education by using cyber infrastructure to develop and make available integrated data repositories and intelligent, user-friendly software solutions.

**Goal 6 - Education:**
Create a scholarly environment to promote research skills and intellectual development for Nevada educators and students (K–12, undergraduate, and graduate).

**Goal 7 - Small Business Innovation Research:**
Encourage innovation in the State of Nevada through business development and the Small Business Innovative Research and the Small Business Technology Transfer (SBIR/STTR) programs.
Goal 8 - Project Integration and Synergy:
Promote climate change scientific discovery and project integration and synergism by conducting interdisciplinary research on climate change and its effects.

2.2 Quarter 2 Evaluation Components
The following EPSCoR activities were conducted between September 1, 2010 and May 20, 2011. Evaluation results and/or evaluation forms of these project components are included in this Quarter 2 report:

- Annual Nevada Climate Change Conference
- Climate Change Seminar Series
- Annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium
- Incorporation of findings of the External Research and Technical Advisory Board (ERTAB) into the evaluation
- Development of Data Portal survey
- Development of Technical Writing Assistance survey
Section 3. Evaluation Findings

3.1 Annual Nevada Climate Change Meeting

Background
The Annual Nevada Climate Change Meeting serves as a forum for sharing research progress and findings of the NSF EPSCoR Climate Change Project, as well as to encourage networking and communication among participants from the various participating university campuses. The meeting also serves to showcase the research and education activities to the project’s external advisory board, State EPSCoR Board vice presidents for research and other executives of Nevada System of Higher Education. The location alternates between north (UNR) and south (UNLV) campuses. Attendees include the climate change project’s External Research and Advisory Board (ERTAB) members, vice presidents for research, Nevada State EPSCoR Advisory Board members, project members (faculty, postdocs, and graduate students), and any other interested faculty or students. This year, the meeting was held on February 1, 2011 in Reno, Nevada.

Participants
The demographic description of all meeting participants is shown in Figure 1. Participants are primarily male (75%) and Caucasian (78%).

Figure 1. Demographic description of Annual Nevada Climate Change Meeting participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| American Indian / Alaska Native | 1 | 1%
| Asian         | 7  | 9% |
| Black / African American | 0 | 0%
| Caucasian / White | 60 | 78%
| Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | 0 | 0%
| Latino/a      | 4  | 5% |
| Did not indicate | 5 | 7% |

Findings
Thirty-six (46.8%) of the 77 meeting participants submitted a 12-question program evaluation form. The evaluation form is in Appendix A. Participants’ responses to questions on the evaluation form are listed below.

Registration and speakers
Respondents rated their satisfaction with the conference registration process and the speakers and presenters. Results indicate that the respondents were extremely satisfied with the registration
process and the speakers. Over 95% of all participants indicated that they were *satisfied* to *very satisfied* with these aspects of the meeting. Results are displayed in Figure 2.

**Figure 2. Respondents’ satisfaction with registration and speakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied (1)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (2)</th>
<th>Satisfied (3)</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration Process</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers / Presenters</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Length of the research highlight sessions**

Respondents indicated whether they thought the length of the research highlight sessions were too short (1), just about right (2), or too long (3). The overwhelming majority (97%) of respondents indicated that the length of these sessions was appropriate as shown in Figure 3.

**Figure 3. Length of research highlight sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Research Highlight Sessions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Too Short</th>
<th>Just About Right</th>
<th>Too Long</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2--just about right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content of the research highlight sessions, the poster session, and meeting organization**

Participants responded to three, 4-point Likert-type items (1, strongly disagree to 4, strongly agree) assessing their opinions regarding the content of the research highlight sessions, whether or not the poster session effectively spotlighted additional EPSCoR climate change research, and the overall organization of the meeting. The vast majority of respondents found the content of the research highlight sessions to be appropriate and informative (53% strongly agreed, and 41% agreed). Similarly, the majority of respondents believe that the poster session effectively illustrated additional NSF EPSCoR climate change project research (30% strongly agreed, 64% agreed). Finally, the majority of the survey respondents also believed that the meeting was well organized (61% strongly agreed, and 36% agreed). Results are displayed in Figure 4.

**Figure 4. Research highlight and poster sessions and meeting organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Highlight / Poster Session / Meeting organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The content of the research highlight sessions was appropriate and informative.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The poster session effectively illustrated additional research being conducted as part of the EPSCoR Climate Change Project.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The meeting was well organized.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall rating of the meeting
Participants rated the meeting on a scale from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent). Ninety-seventy percent of respondents rated the meeting as excellent or good. Three percent rated the meeting fair. Results are displayed in Figure 5.

Figure 5. Respondents’ overall rating of the meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating of Meeting</th>
<th>Percentage of Ratings</th>
<th>Mean rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Poor (1)</td>
<td>Fair (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strengths and areas of improvement
Respondents indicated aspects of the meeting they liked the most.

- A couple of the talks were excellent.
- Concise presentations, informative, and timely.
- Research highlights were interesting and informative.
- Hearing about the research.
- Variety and quality of speeches.
- Breakout sessions.
- Exposure to large diversity of activities.
- Being able to understand how my work fits into the grand-scheme of things in NSF EPSCoR climate change project.
- Chance to meet people that I have only known through e-mails.
- Networking
- Student involvement
- One minute poster presentations, great idea.
- Efficiency, connectivity.
- Organized.
- Cleaner facilities.

Respondents also indicated aspects of the meeting they liked least.

- The poster session was sub-utilized.
- Limited opportunity to visit / network.
- Presentations could have been better.
- Not enough time for questions.
- Too small of a room / not good for discussions.
- Limited internet access and power outlets.
- That it was only 1 day, traveling in 1 day, the early times.
- Flight time is too early.
- Food prep in the back of the room during presentations... cold food, no hot water
- Lunch needed more vegetarian options.

Suggestions for future meetings
Respondents made suggestions for improvement and indicated kinds of sessions they would like to see at future meetings.

- Longer poster presentations.
- A session or talk to elaborate connections / linkages between various components
- Same, but perhaps add some real time hands on demos of portal and other web-based applications.
- Integration. ISPs will create lots of material, but there are some of the same components that exist already.
• Talks on what one component needs from another in terms of data, materials, process, or activities to increase interdisciplinary research.
• More synthesis as that develops.
• Development of proposal terms for “life past EPSCoR”.
• See some results of interdisciplinary research and educational outreach.
• Introducing a ‘best presentation award’ and ‘best poster award’.
• Invite a non-EPSCoR keynote speaker; it would foster additional motivation-collaboration.

Commendations and recommendations for the Nevada Climate Change meeting

Commendations
The majority of respondents indicated that they were pleased with every aspect of the meeting. Eighty-six percent of respondents report being very satisfied with speakers and presenters. Ninety-seven percent indicate that the length of the research highlight sessions was just about right. Ninety-seven percent report that the meeting as a whole was good or excellent. Finally, open-ended responses suggest that respondents enjoyed the opportunity for networking and most believe the talks were very informative and relevant.

Recommendations
1. Some respondents indicate there was not enough time for questions or discussion. Others suggested that the start time for the meeting was too early and caused travel issues. Include a short amount of time for discussion to clarify information and foster new ideas and collaboration. It may also be beneficial to start the meeting at a later time in the day, as some respondents suggested that they had to book very early flights in order to attend the meeting.

2. The evaluation form is very general and does not evaluate specific components of the meeting. Demographic questions and questions related to project goals, meeting impact and application were not included on the evaluation form. Likert scales within the evaluation form vary, making cohesive reporting difficult. Revise future evaluation forms to align them with the agenda of the meeting. Collect additional demographic information including position (undergraduate, graduate, post-doc, faculty, senior researcher, other) and institutional affiliation. Include questions pertaining to achievement of project goals, the impact participation in the meeting had on participants, and how they will apply what they have learned on future evaluation forms. Standardize the number of options in Likert scales to facilitate reporting.

3. Forty-eight percent of participants completed the evaluation form. Distribute evaluation forms at the end of each meeting and ensure that all participants complete and turn in the evaluation forms before they leave the meeting.
3.2 Climate Change Seminar Series

Background
The Climate Change Seminar Series (http://studiog.unlv.tv/) is held once a month at UNLV and is now broadcast on UNLV TV. The primary purpose of the seminar series is to promote the activities from the EPSCoR project to a wider audience and to engage stakeholders who are conducting or are interested in conducting climate change related research. EPSCoR principal investigators select a speaker for each seminar. The seminars are hosted at either UNLV, DRI or UNR but are available for viewing at remote locations. The list of seminars that occurred this project year and their dates, topics, locations, and presenters is shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Climate change seminar dates, topics, locations, and presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date presented</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Location hosted</th>
<th>Remote viewing locations</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Institutional affiliation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2010</td>
<td>Climate and Floristic Variation in the Great Basin – Mojave Desert</td>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>UNR, WEBEX</td>
<td>David Charlet</td>
<td>Community College of Southern Nevada</td>
<td>Professor of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2010</td>
<td>Climate modeling: from global climate models to regional climate applications</td>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>UNLV, Great Basin College, WEBEX</td>
<td>John Mejia</td>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>Post-doc, Atmospheric Sciences program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2010</td>
<td>It wasn’t any colder when I was a kid: Heating up instruction on climate change</td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>UNR, Great Basin College, Live Stream</td>
<td>Gale Sinatra</td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>Professor, Educational Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2011</td>
<td>Operation of Colorado River Reservoirs in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>Terry Fulp</td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado Region</td>
<td>Deputy Regional Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 23, 2011</td>
<td>Drivers of Arid Land Tree Population Dynamics in a Changing Climate</td>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Sarah Karam</td>
<td>UNR</td>
<td>Graduate student, Department of Natural Resources/ Env. Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2011</td>
<td>Change and Rural Nevadans: What Do They Think and Why</td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>DRI</td>
<td>Ahmad Saleh Safi</td>
<td>UNLV</td>
<td>Graduate student, Department of Env. Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Participants**

People who attended the seminars at hosting and remote locations completed evaluation forms. Due to the method in which evaluation forms were collected it is unclear how many people attended seminars at each hosting or remote location. Online viewers did not complete evaluation forms. The demographic description of people who attended in the Climate Change Seminar Series is displayed in Figure 7. The majority of participants were from higher education/graduate students (77%). Two-thirds were male and 87% were Caucasian or Asian; two percent were Hispanic.

**Figure 7. Demographic description of Climate Change Seminar participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Charlet (N=23)</th>
<th>Fulp (N=36)</th>
<th>Karam (N=6)</th>
<th>Mejia (N=17)</th>
<th>Sinatra (N=35)</th>
<th>Safi (N=10)</th>
<th>Average (N=127)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you serve on current NV EPSCoR Award?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>11 (65%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>24 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>21 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>3 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (11%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed Faculty / Admin</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
<td>4 (66%)</td>
<td>7 (41%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>7 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K12 Educator / Admin</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Doc</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>18 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td>8 (47%)</td>
<td>10 (28%)</td>
<td>7 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based org.</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Affiliate</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>19 (53%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
<td>17 (48%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>16 (44%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>4 (24%)</td>
<td>16 (46%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latino(a)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic / Latino(a)</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>25 (69%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>14 (82%)</td>
<td>25 (71%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>15 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian/Alaska Native</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6 (26%)</td>
<td>7 (19%)</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>1 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>22 (61%)</td>
<td>4 (67%)</td>
<td>13 (76%)</td>
<td>25 (71%)</td>
<td>8 (80%)</td>
<td>15 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings
Participants rated aspects of each seminar on a four-point Likert scale. Ratings focused on the seminar overall, the speaker, audio-visual aids, presentation handouts, presentation locations, the time of the presentations, and the length of the presentations. Results are broken down by presenter and displayed in Figure 8. Mean ratings can be considered to trend towards positive or negative based on the following scale:

- **Excellent**: 3.26 – 4.00
- **Good**: 2.51 – 3.25
- **Average**: 1.76 – 2.50
- **Poor**: 1.00 – 1.75

Figure 8. Rating of Climate Change Seminar components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminar aspect</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charlet</td>
<td>Fulp</td>
<td>Karam</td>
<td>Mejia</td>
<td>Sinatra</td>
<td>Safi</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td>N μ Rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>21 3.76</td>
<td>35 3.54</td>
<td>6 3.50</td>
<td>13 3.25</td>
<td>35 3.46</td>
<td>10 3.60</td>
<td>20 3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>21 3.90</td>
<td>35 3.74</td>
<td>6 3.83</td>
<td>12 3.67</td>
<td>35 3.54</td>
<td>9 3.56</td>
<td>20 3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual aids</td>
<td>22 3.40</td>
<td>35 3.51</td>
<td>6 3.50</td>
<td>14 2.00</td>
<td>34 3.24</td>
<td>10 3.80</td>
<td>20 3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation handouts</td>
<td>6 3.50</td>
<td>6 3.33</td>
<td>3 3.00</td>
<td>1 3.00</td>
<td>13 2.75</td>
<td>2 4.00</td>
<td>5 3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>22 3.40</td>
<td>34 3.68</td>
<td>6 3.50</td>
<td>15 2.40</td>
<td>34 3.68</td>
<td>10 3.90</td>
<td>20 3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of day</td>
<td>21 3.40</td>
<td>35 3.57</td>
<td>6 3.47</td>
<td>16 3.25</td>
<td>34 3.65</td>
<td>10 3.40</td>
<td>20 3.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation length</td>
<td>20 3.50</td>
<td>35 3.68</td>
<td>6 3.50</td>
<td>12 3.33</td>
<td>33 3.42</td>
<td>10 3.60</td>
<td>19 3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments
Additional comments were not available to the evaluator for several of the presentations. A graduate student had compiled the data without including responses to open-ended questions. The graduate student moved out of state and the location of the evaluation forms is unknown. Comments that the evaluator received are listed below.

Sinatra
- **Way too long presenting speakers – I want to hear what the speaker has to say not hear introduction forever and all of the credits, etc. Perhaps that could just be presented in a slide or resource sheet.**

Mejia
- **Excellent presentation and systematic approach.**
- **John’s audiovisuals were great. Audiovisuals for others were problematic.**
- **Fine job done by John. We need to strengthen communication among project components. We also need to follow up on addressing identified challenges across components.**
Commendations and recommendations for the Climate Change Seminar Series

Commendations
All aspects of almost all of the seminars were rated very high. All speakers and presentation lengths were rated excellent. Audio-visual aids and handouts were rated good to excellent.

Recommendations
1. The evaluation form collected valuable information; however, general information about the presenter, topic, and location of remote viewing was not available on the forms that were completed by participants. In addition, the evaluation form is very general and does not evaluate specific components of the meeting. It is unclear why Mejia’s ratings are relatively low yet comments made about his presentation and audiovisuals are very positive. Questions related to project goals, meeting impact and application were not included on the evaluation form.

Refine the evaluation form.
Include the following information on the evaluation form before copies are made at each location:
- Presenter’s name, position, and institutional affiliation
- Date of presentation
- Topic of presentation
- Location in which presentation is hosted
- Location of remote viewing

Collect demographic information that is standard to the EPSCoR project. Provide an opportunity for participants to write in their ethnicity if it is not listed. Align evaluation forms with the agenda of the presentation if possible and provide more opportunities for participants to explain their ratings. Include questions pertaining to achievement of project goals, the impact participation in the meeting had on participants, and how they will apply what they have learned on future evaluation forms. Ask a question pertaining to suggestions to improve each presentation and the seminar series overall.

2. Participants who view the online live stream from UNLV TV are not able to provide feedback on the presentation.
Post the evaluation form online and make it available to viewers after they finish viewing the seminar. Download viewers’ evaluations and include their responses with the other on-site evaluation results.

3. Information about each seminar and presenter was not readily available in a central location. Some evaluation forms and responses to open-ended questions were not available.
Maintain a spreadsheet of presentations that includes date of presentation, location hosted, remove viewing locations, presenters’ name, institutional affiliation, and position. Assign one person who will collect all evaluation forms and send them to the evaluator.

4. The majority of seminar participants are male and Caucasian or Asian.
Advertise this seminar series in locations that have more female and/or underrepresented minority individuals. Encourage professors to advertise the seminar series to the students in their classes and give course points for attending.
3.3 Annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium

Background
The annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium provides undergraduate award recipients the opportunity to have a professional conference experience by allowing them to engage in either an oral or poster presentation. The NSF EPSCoR project supports the hosting of the conference and transportation for undergraduate students from their institution to the conference. The symposium is held in mid-April at either the University of Nevada-Reno or the University of Nevada-Las Vegas. The 2011 Undergraduate Research Symposium was held on April 15 and 16 at UNLV.

Participants
Questions requesting demographic information of presenters and public participants were not included in the Undergraduate Research Symposium surveys.

Findings
Two evaluations were conducted at this event; an undergraduate student presenter survey and a public survey.

Undergraduate student presenters’ responses
Presenters responded to a series of yes or no questions (sometimes including a maybe option) regarding their experience presenting at the Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium. Their responses indicate that the vast majority of presenters believe that the experience will help them feel more comfortable for future presentations (87.5%) and that most would participate again or over the summer if given the chance (66.1%). The majority of respondents also indicated they would attend the event again, even if not presenting (87.5%). Finally, most presenters were satisfied with the day, time, and location of the event (87.5%), as well as the food / beverage options (87.5%). The results for this series of questions are displayed in Figure 9.

Figure 9. Undergraduate student presenters’ experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe this experience will help you feel comfortable for future presentations?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you participate in this experience again in the future / over the summer?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>• I will come if I have more results available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not as much traffic for people defending posters as there should be, since people are divided between posters and orals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did this day, time, and location work best for you?</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>• It started a bit too early (3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Got here a little late to give an accurate evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bad timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you attend this event next year?</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>• Event seems to be a great mix of culture and research!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If I have another project going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• I won’t receive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maybe (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were you satisfied with the food and beverage options?</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>• Maybe more food (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not a lot of fruit or pastry options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On a scale ranging from uncomfortable to comfortable, symposium presenters were asked to indicate how comfortable they felt while they were presenting their research. The majority (92.85\%) of respondents indicated that they felt either very comfortable (44.64\%) or comfortable (48.21\%) while presenting. Results are displayed in Figure 10.

**Figure 10. Undergraduate students’ comfort presenting**

![Bar chart showing comfort levels](chart10)

Undergraduate presenters were also asked how enjoyable (from not at all enjoyable to very enjoyable) they found the event. The majority (78.7\%) reported finding the event either very enjoyable (35.7\%) or enjoyable (42.9\%). No students selected not at all or a little enjoyable. These results are shown in Figure 11.

**Figure 11. Undergraduate students’ enjoyment of the symposium**

![Bar chart showing enjoyment levels](chart11)

Students made the following comments and suggestions to improve the symposium.

- *It was nice to hear about campus research*
- *Great see what other labs are studying especially from other areas (Reno)*
- *Very organized, helpful thank you!*
- *Great event. Next year we will be here*
- *Great job*
- *Job well done!! Kudos for the hard work and dedication of the staff!*
- *The event was fine. Sweet*
- *I think it looked great!*
- *Doug Hanks did a great job as speaking and he is knowledgeable*
- *A one minute presentation to everyone for the various projects might be a cool way to kick things off*
- *Since I was participating I felt nervous so I was not exploring other posters as others would but I found their event to be very interesting but intimidating because other posters were put next to graduate or Honors College posters when mine was just from Science 101*
- *Not very well organized*
- *Wish I better informed about the event. Example my poster being printed for me was great however I spent money printing it*
• Organization and communication on the behalf of the organizing committee, feel very uninformed, confused, rushed and irritated by the experience
• Scheduling talks and posters at the same time is a poor choice. Each should get their own time slot. Also, posters should be organized by discipline. Correspondence was a bit lacking, too.
• Maybe a little more organized
• Stagger the posters and oral talks so I can go to something that interest me
• You should probably inform participants ahead of time about due dates, I did not receive notice until the day my poster was needed
• Make all dates more known and when things are due, etc.
• Timing. The posters and talks should not be at the same time. It halves the audience for sets of presenters
• Would have liked to know that come with money for food
• I wish I could have attended the oral presentation that is more related to my interest. They are scheduled during my poster presentation
• Not many professionals came by

Public survey responses of symposium attendees
When symposium attendees were asked how comfortable they felt listening to and understanding the content being presented during the poster and oral presentation sessions 100% indicated that they felt either very comfortable (65.1%) or comfortable (34.9%) listening to and understanding the information. No participants felt uncomfortable understanding the content. One participant commented, “Not my area of major, but interesting.” Results are shown in Figure 12.

Figure 12. Attendees’ understanding of poster / presentation content

Symposium attendees were also asked how much they enjoyed the conference. Nearly 90% of the respondents reported they found the event either very enjoyable (47.6%) or enjoyable (41.3%). Participants commented, “It was nice to hear about campus research.” and “I was totally surprised about how much fun it was.” Results are shown in Figure 13.
Symposium attendees indicated how the event helped them learn more about academic programs and research opportunities being offered at UNLV. The overwhelming majority (87.30%) indicated that they did learn about these things via the symposium. Respondents were also asked whether they would attend the symposium next year. Results indicate that the overwhelming majority (92.06%) would attend the event in 2012. Results are displayed in Figure 14.

Three participants who said they may not attend again stated the following reasons:
- I will attend again as long as I am provided with the information and the date(s).
- I will not attend again because I am graduating this Fall.
- I will not attend again because I will not be in the area.

Participants made the following comments and suggestions for the symposium.
- Josh Bielinski keynote. I thought it was an interesting presentation. I even took a note to research later!
- Josh Bielinski was very informative
- Great speaker, knowledgeable! Wonderful sense of humor Bielinski presentation
- Douglas Hanks was very informative and well spoken
- I learned a lot about the Las Vegas neighborhoods.
- It's nice to have a festival concerning the community on campus
- Excellent organization and size (not too big or too small).
- Well organized; using three sessions was a good idea
- Nice setting. Professional posters! Good job!
- Everything was amazing
- Nice event :)

---

**Figure 13. Attendees’ enjoyment of the symposium**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall, how enjoyable was this event?</th>
<th>A little enjoyable</th>
<th>Somewhat enjoyable</th>
<th>Enjoyable</th>
<th>Very enjoyable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of attendees</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 14. Attendees’ learning experience and future attendance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you believe this experience helped you learn more about the academic programs and research opportunities being offered at UNLV?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of attendees</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would you attend this event next year?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of attendees</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Excellent presentations
• Very impressive
• Keep up the good work
• A little time to review posters of others
• Greater advertisement of event through businesses. For example I work at Citibank and I would have liked to see posters-the only way I knew about it was my daughter is a UNLV student
• More publicity in highschools
• This just needs to be advertised more
• Presenters were not available in most posters
• Poster introductions by presenter
• Many oral presentations went over my head. I would like to listen to the humanities oral presentations because that is my interest. I am unable to do so because my poster session conflicts (is at the same time) as my associated presentation topics.
• Detailed maps and schedules would help
• Wish overview of weak structures in NV. NV placement in sqft were concerning another (#2 withholding AC)
• Faculty response. Students should be told ahead of time that bios will be printed and hung on their posters. Poster sessions should not run concurrent with talks-it’s unfair to all of the students who don’t get the audience they deserve. Preparation instructions were very confusing-the early “draft” set off near panic in my group because the draft nature was not communicated.
• You guys should have rehearsed once. Seemed off on some people
• We need chairs in the ballroom.

Commendations and recommendations for the Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium

Commendations
Attendees stated that this event was an excellent opportunity for Las Vegas. Nearly 80% of the presenters who responded to the evaluation questionnaire found the event either enjoyable (42.9%) or very enjoyable (35.7%) and 87.5% reported they would attend next year’s symposium. Every attendee who participated in the evaluation reported feeling either comfortable (34.9%) or very comfortable (65.1%) listening to and understanding the content that was presented at the poster and presentation sessions. Nearly 90% of the attendees reported that they found the event enjoyable (41.3%) or very enjoyable (47.6%). Finally, 93.6% of attendees indicated that they would attend next year’s event and nearly 90% reported that they learned more about academic and research opportunities at UNLV.

Recommendations
1. Several students commented on the timing of the symposium and the events. Consider starting at 8:00 instead of 7:30 am. Try to not book poster sessions concurrent with talks. Rotate areas of poster sessions so students can view other students’ posters. Plan ahead and give students ample notification of expectations.

2. Several students commented that there wasn’t enough variety and quantity of food. Offer a variety of food options. Ensure there is enough for all attendees and presenters.

3. Attendees requested more advertising and publicity of the symposium. Publicize this event more widely – in high schools, on university campuses and in classrooms, in central business areas. Provide detailed maps and schedules.
3.4 External Research and Technical Advisory Board (ERTAB) Report

Findings
ERTAB members made 20 recommendations in the final report. The majority of recommendations pertain to sustainability or business plans, marketing and outreach for the project, and gearing the project towards the needs of the broader community.

Incorporation of ERTAB findings into evaluation plan
Of the 20 recommendations in the ERTAB report, two are particularly relevant to the external evaluation. The first pertinent recommendation refers to Nevada’s potential hosting of an NSF EPSCoR workshop aimed specifically at the broader scientific community and focused on clarifying how the scientific community can maximize benefit from the transects and the data portal. If this workshop is conducted, SmartStart will develop and conduct the workshop evaluation, documenting attendees’ suggestions for improvement, gains in knowledge, and impacts related to project goals.

A second recommendation encourages increased engagement of the broader community. The ERTAB suggests that “the Nevada team engage the broader community and evaluate user needs in order to create a data portal site that is geared for the needs of the users”. With the assistance of the Track 2 interoperability component lead, SmartStart developed a data portal survey (Appendix E) to assess the needs of users. It has been distributed to all EPSCoR participants. Data will be collected and sent to the person in charge of the Nevada data portal to integrate Nevada’s users’ needs into the data portal. If non-EPSCoR participants should also be surveyed SmartStart will distribute the data portal survey to all potential users identified by the PI.
Section 4. Commendations and Recommendations for the Track 1 EPSCoR Project

Based on the results of this evaluation the following commendations and recommendations for the Track 1 EPSCoR project have been identified.

4.1 Commendations

Based on the results of the three components evaluated during quarter 2, the Track 1 EPSCoR project is doing an excellent job meeting the needs of project participants. The evaluator has seen a small snapshot of the project through the eyes of the participants of the Nevada Climate Change Meeting, Climate Change Seminar Series, and Undergraduate Research Symposium. All project activities were rated very highly. The evaluator looks forward to getting to know project components and participants better to gain a broader understanding of the strengths and areas of improvement of this project.

4.2 Recommendations

1. Faculty, students, and the general public who participated in the Nevada Climate Change Meeting, Climate Change Seminar Series, and Undergraduate Research Symposium made useful suggestions to improve these activities. The evaluator made specific recommendations on pages 7, 11, and 16. Review these recommendations, share them with individuals in charge of the activities, and consider implementing them to improve future meetings, seminars, and symposiums.

2. Various forms of demographic information are collected on project evaluation forms. Some evaluation forms do not request demographic information. Evaluation forms are not aligned with agendas and do not include questions pertaining to the impact of participation, applicability of information, and achievement of project goals. Consequently, it is unclear whether or not project activities are working towards achieving EPSCoR project goals. Standardize collection of demographic information across the Track 1 EPSCoR project. Include the same demographic questions, options for responses, and question formats on all surveys and evaluation forms so demographic data can be compared across programs. Align demographic questions with NSF reporting requirements. Align evaluation forms with program agendas and include questions pertaining to achievement of project goals, the impact participation in the meeting had on participants, and how they will apply what they have learned. The evaluator will work with directors to revise evaluation forms and incorporate these recommendations.

3. Participants in these three project activities are primarily male and Caucasian or Asian. Continue to work towards involving more females and underrepresented minorities in this EPSCoR project and activities. Advertise and publicize activities and events more widely and make a greater effort to personally invite individuals from underrepresented groups to get involved.
Appendix A: Annual Nevada Climate Change Meeting Evaluation Form

Nevada NSF EPSCoR Climate Change, Education & Outreach Annual State Meeting Evaluation

Thank you for your participation in this year’s NSF EPSCoR Climate Change, Education & Outreach State Meeting. Your feedback is important to the project. Please take a moment to complete the following evaluation (front and back) so that Nevada EPSCoR may continue providing quality programs.

1) Overall, how would you rate this year’s NSF EPSCoR Climate Change State meeting?
   □ Very poor
   □ Poor
   □ Average
   □ Very good
   □ Excellent

2) Overall, how satisfied were you with the speakers/presenters?
   □ Very Dissatisfied
   □ Dissatisfied
   □ Satisfied
   □ Very Satisfied

3) Did you feel the length of Research Highlights Sessions were too long, just about right, or too short?
   □ Too long
   □ Just about right
   □ Too short

4) The content of Research Highlight sessions was appropriate and informative.
   □ Strongly Disagree
   □ Disagree
5) The Poster Session effectively illustrated additional research being conducted as part of the NSF EPSCoR Climate Change project.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

6) The meeting was well organized.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

7) How satisfied were you with the registration process?
   - Very Dissatisfied
   - Dissatisfied
   - Satisfied
   - Very Satisfied

8) What did you like most about the meeting?
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

9) What did you like least about the meeting?
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________

10) What kinds of sessions would you like to see included at future meetings?
12) Please provide any additional comments/suggestions.
Appendix B: Climate Change Seminar Series Evaluation Form

National Science Foundation
Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (NSF EPSCoR)

Nevada Climate Change Seminar Series
Date:____________ Location:____________ Presenter:__________________________
Topic:____________________________________________________________________

About You:
Completion of this section will provide very basic information in order to capture the demographics of NSF EPSCoR program participants. Such reportable information, although voluntary, strengthens future applications for funding, ultimately providing research program sustainability and growth.

Do you serve on the current Nevada NSF EPSCoR Award?  □ Yes  □ No

What best describes your professional affiliation? (Choose one)
□ Higher Ed Faculty/Admin  □ K-12 Educator/Admin  □ Post Doc  □ Graduate Student
□ Undergraduate Student  □ Community-based Organization  □ Industrial Affiliate
□ Other:__________________

Are you:  □ Male  □ Female

Ethnicity: □ Hispanic or Latino  □ Non Hispanic or Latino  □ Prefer not to respond

Race:
□ American Indian/Alaska Native  □ Asian  □ Black/African American
□ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  □ White  □ Prefer not to respond
About the Program:

I. How would you rate the seminar in terms of the following?

Overall: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The Speaker: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The audio-visual aids: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The presentation handouts: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The location: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The time of day: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The presentation time/length: □ Excellent □ Good □ Fair □ Poor
The level of topic difficulty: □ Too hard □ Hard □ Just right □ Easy □ Too easy

II. Please indicate the level of agreement that most accurately reflects your opinion of the speaker.

Very knowledgeable about the subject:
□ Strongly agree □ Agree □ Agree nor disagree □ Disagree □ Strongly disagree

Well-prepared for this presentation:
□ Strongly agree □ Agree □ Agree nor disagree □ Disagree □ Strongly disagree

Motivated you to learn more about the topic:
□ Strongly agree □ Agree □ Agree nor disagree □ Disagree □ Strongly disagree

Clearly related research to climate change issues:
□ Strongly agree □ Agree □ Agree nor disagree □ Disagree □ Strongly disagree

Did you receive the information you expected? □ Yes □ No

Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Additional Comments: ______________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Thank you for your participation and feedback!
Appendix C: Annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium Student Evaluation Form

1. How comfortable were you talking about your poster and or presentation?  (Student Survey)
   - Very Comfortable
   - Comfortable
   - Uncomfortable
   - Very Uncomfortable
   - Not Applicable

2. Do you believe this experience will help you feel comfortable for future presentations?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Maybe

3. Would you participate in this experience again in the future or over the summer?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Maybe

4. Did this day, time and location work best for you?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Would you attend this event next year?
   - Yes
   - No

6. Overall, how enjoyable was this event?
   - Very Enjoyable
   - Enjoyable
   - Somewhat Enjoyable
   - A Little Enjoyable
   - Not at all Enjoyable

7. Were you satisfied with the food and beverage options?
   - Yes
   - No

8. Please share any additional comments or suggestions on how we can improve this event.
   Comments/Suggestions
Appendix D: Annual Nevada Undergraduate Research Symposium Public Evaluation Form

1. How comfortable were you listening to and understanding the content being presented during the poster and or presentation sessions?
   - Very Comfortable
   - Comfortable
   - Uncomfortable
   - Very Uncomfortable
   - Not Applicable
   Comments/Suggestions

2. Do you believe this experience helped you learn more about the academic programs and research opportunities being offered at UNLV?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Maybe
   Comments/Suggestions

3. Would you attend this event next year?
   - Yes
   - No
   Comments/Suggestions

4. Overall, how enjoyable was this event?
   - Very Enjoyable
   - Enjoyable
   - Somewhat Enjoyable
   - A Little Enjoyable
   - Not at all Enjoyable
   Comments/Suggestions

5. Please share any additional comments or suggestions on how we can improve this event.
   Comments/Suggestions
Appendix D: Data Portal Survey

2011 EPSCoR Track 2 Data Portal Survey

Page 1 - Question 1 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What state are you in?

- Nevada
- New Mexico
- Idaho

Page 1 - Question 2 - Open Ended - One Line [Mandatory]

What is your name?

Page 1 - Question 3 - Open Ended - One Line [Mandatory]

What is your primary e-mail address?

Page 1 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What type of data do you have?

- Point-Time Series or single Observations/measurements
- Area-Time Series or single Observations/measurements
- Model outputs (point-time series or single values)
- Model outputs (area-time series or single values)
- Model outputs (gridded time-series or single)
- Remote sensing (aerial or space-borne)
- GIS data
- LiDAR
- Documents
- Other, please specify

Page 1 - Question 5 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

What is the format of the data?

- ESRI Shapefile
- NetCDF
- GeoTIFF
- HDF
- LAS
- ASCII/Unicode - Comma-separated values (CSV)
- ASCII/Unicode - Tab-separated values
- ASCII/Unicode - XML
- ASCII/Unicode - other
- Excel
- Word Processor
- PDF
- Other, please specify
Page 1 - Question 6 - Open Ended - One Line
What is the current number of files of this type in your collection?

Page 1 - Question 7 - Open Ended - One Line
What is the projected number of data products of this type that you expect to produce by the end of the EPSCoR project(s)?

Page 1 - Question 8 - Open Ended - One Line
What is the current storage volume (GB) of the data products of this type?

Page 1 - Question 9 - Open Ended - One Line
What is the project storage volume (GB) of the data products of this type?

Page 1 - Question 10 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets)
Do you already have metadata for these data? If so, in what format?

- No metadata
- FGDC - XML
- FGDC - Other
- ISO 19115 - XML
- EML
- Dublin Core
- Darwin Core
- Other, please specify

Thank you for sending your data set information. If you have any questions about the Tri-state Data Portal please contact:

Karl Benedict
University of New Mexico
kbene@edac.unm.edu
(505) 277-3622
# Appendix E: Technical Writing assistance Survey

Page 1 - Question 1 - Open Ended - One or More Lines with Prompt [Mandatory]

Please answer these questions.

- Your name?
- Your email address?

Page 1 - Heading

Quality and Usefulness of Technical Writers Assistance

Page 1 - Question 2 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How many times did you use the Technical Writers Assistance services?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- More than 3. Please specify how many.

Page 1 - Question 3 - Open Ended - Comments Box [Mandatory]

Please indicate the month(s) and year(s) you received these services. Write in a month/year for each time you used the service.

Page 1 - Question 4 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How would you rate the usefulness of the editing services provided to you:

- Greatly improved my proposal(s)
- Somewhat improved my proposal(s)
- Did not improve my proposal(s)

Page 1 - Question 5 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

If your proposal(s) was funded, do you feel that the editorial services contributed the success?

- My proposal(s) was not funded.
- The editorial services probably did not contribute to the success of my proposal.
- The editorial services probably increased the chances of my proposal being funded.
- The editorial services were essential to my proposal being funded.
Page 1 - Question 6 - Yes or No [Mandatory]

Would you use this service again?

- Yes
- No
- Please explain why or why not.

Page 1 - Question 7 - Open Ended - Comments Box [Mandatory]

How can we improve these editorial services and make them more useful for you?

Page 1 - Heading

Status of Proposals Submitted

Page 1 - Question 8 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

How many proposals did you submit during this time period from September 1, 2008 to August 31, 2010?

- 1 [Skip to 2]
- 2 [Skip to 3]
- 3 [Skip to 4]
- 4 [Skip to 5]
- 5 [Skip to 6]
- 6 [Skip to 7]
- 7 [Skip to 8]
- 8 [Skip to 9]
- 9 [Skip to 10]
- 10 [Skip to 11]

Page 2 - Question 9 - Choice - One Answer (Bullets) [Mandatory]

Has the proposal you submitted been funded, pending, or denied?

- Funded [Skip to End]
- Pending [Skip to End]
- Denied [Skip to End]

Page 2 - Question 10 - Open Ended - One or More Lines with Prompt

If it was funded, please provide the following information:

- PI/CoPI names
- Proposal title
- Funding agency
- Amount funded
- Award date
If your proposal was denied, did you resubmit?

- No
- Not yet but I plan to resubmit.
- Yes

[Repeated questions have been deleted from this Word document form of the survey]

Thank You Page

We appreciate the time that you have taken to complete this survey. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us.

Lisa Kohne, External Evaluator: lkohne@smartstartecs.com

Gayle Dana, Project Principal Investigator: gayle.dana@dri.edu

THANK YOU