

## **Guidelines for GPRAMA Annual Science Progress Review**

Thank you for assisting us with our annual science progress appraisal. This evaluation is a critical component of our compliance with the 2010 Government Performance and Results Modernization Act (GPRAMA), which mandates the processes by which each federal agency must plan and evaluate performance. In addition to monitoring progress on missions in formulation and development, the Science Mission Directorate (SMD) Annual Performance Plan seeks to measure progress made toward each of our science goals during the year in question. These division science goals correspond directly to those outlined in the 2014 SMD Science Plan. Due to the subjective nature of such an assessment, this component of the Performance Plan calls for evaluation by external expert review. Our advisory committees perform this role, reviewing progress toward the end of each fiscal year.

The committees are tasked with making a high-level assessment of science performance and should base their evaluations on their general sense of progress as evidenced by key accomplishments or disappointments for each of the science goals. Achievements must represent growth in the previously existing body of knowledge and are ideally limited to published results (preferably in peer-reviewed literature) during the timeframe in question. Although the evaluation is required for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Annual Performance Report, due to the Astrophysics Advisory Committee's meeting schedule, the timeframe covered is the approximately twelve month period since the previous review in July 2016. Results that emerged too late in FY 2016 to be included in last year's evaluation should be included for FY 2017. Please note that only achievements resulting in whole or in part from NASA-funded programs/data should be considered.

To assist the committee in this effort, the Astrophysics Division has provided input that may be used as a starting point for your discussion. The committee may consider the information provided and other information as desired to arrive at a color-coded rating for each objective. The rating for each objective should be accompanied by brief explanatory text that includes an overview and supporting achievements, noting associated literature or press citations. The ratings assigned will appear, along with representative achievements, in the Agency's Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Performance Report. Please note that per Office of Management and Budget (OMB) direction, the Performance Report text must be written in language appropriate for the intelligent layperson, so it is helpful to our process if the committee considers this in the development of the evaluation text. (See the FY 2016 Annual Performance Report at [https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/atoms/files/nasa\\_fy\\_2018\\_viper-508.pdf](https://www.nasa.gov/sites/default/files/atoms/files/nasa_fy_2018_viper-508.pdf), page 97-108, for an example of the text that is published.) It is emphasized that the committee may retain, edit, or replace the material provided by the Astrophysics Division. Should the committee assign a rating of less than "green," or "fully met," for any objective, we request that specific explanatory text be provided. This will allow the Agency to properly present the committee's concerns in the Performance Report.

We suggest that you structure your review of the provided materials (and any additions you choose to make) along the following lines:

1. Determine if the accomplishment or disappointment is significant. We should advance for recognition only achievements that clearly advance our state of knowledge. Any disappointment or deficiency that represents a setback should be included. Please note that comprehensive coverage of the objective and/or contributing missions is not necessary nor intended – only review/evaluation to the extent sufficient for the committee to reach a conclusion is required.
2. Assign a color code to each of the objectives. The color code definitions remain the same as in previous years, and are as follows:
  - GREEN: Expectations for the research program fully met or exceeded in the context of resources invested.
  - YELLOW: Some notable or significant shortfalls in context of resources invested, but some worthy scientific advancements achieved.
  - RED: Major disappointments or shortfalls in the context of resources invested, uncompensated by other unusually positive results.

In summary, using these guidelines, the committee's input should consist of:

- Color code assessment for each objective
- Explanatory text for each objective, with overview and supporting items (from text provided or that developed by committee, as desired)
- Specific explanation to accompany any assessment less than "green"

Please contact your committee Executive Secretary with any questions you may have. Thank you again for your assistance.