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Where we have been

- January, 2006: Discussed what “evaluating the evaluator” meant
  - Helped frame the question
- June, 2006: Had brief discussion of how the evaluation could be modified
  - Considered some options; established a working committee
1. Evaluate based on what?

NSF and other counterparts can evaluate an IUCRC Evaluator's performance based on:

- **How the Evaluator performs the role:**
  - Completeness of data-collection & reporting
  - Timeliness of data-collection, analysis, reporting
  - Quality of evaluation reports
  - Etc.

- **What the Evaluator role entails – evaluation Protocol:**
  - Focus & methods of data-collection
  - Design & validity of questionnaires, other measures
  - Timing of data-collection, analysis, reporting
  - Structure & content of evaluation reports
  - Etc.
Role of Evaluator - Main Elements

- Program evaluation: Data-collection, analysis, reporting
- Liaison & linkage: Communication with constituencies
- Other duties, adopted or negotiated
Role of NSF IUCRC Evaluator: Current Protocol

- **Program evaluation** - Data-collection, analysis, reports:
  - Annual Evaluator's Report
  - *Industry & Faculty Questionnaires*: Collect, analyze, report
  - *LIFE Forms*: Manage distributing, transcribing, IAB review
  - Exit interviews with Industry Member representatives

- **Liaison & linkage** - Communication with constituencies:
  - Center Industrial Advisory Board meetings, Spring & Fall
  - Annual NSF IUCRC Program meeting, January
  - Annual NSF IUCRC Evaluators' meeting, June

- **Other duties**, adopted or negotiated:
  - Consultant / Coach
  - Meeting Facilitator / Leader
  - Mediator, etc.
How well is the evaluation protocol meeting the needs of the “customer”?  

- How important and useful is the information being collected for the customer?  
  - Industry feedback; Faculty feedback; Life forms; Exit interview; Evaluator Report  
- What factors affect the usefulness of the information collected?  
  - The specific information collected  
  - The burden of data collection  
  - The sources of the information  
  - The timeliness of feedback  
- How could the value of the information collected be enhanced?
Next Steps

- Establish a Working Committee:
  - Gray, Lane, Meyer, Scott, Sundstrom,
- Review and evaluate the current Evaluator protocol
- Consider re-designing the protocol
- Explore options for revising the current role
Proposed Strategy

• Revisit and reframe evaluation objective
  • Spend some time now

• Review our current set of roles, tools and products
  – Engage in a self critique of roles and tools
    • Via listserv
  – Solicit input from NSF & directors on
    • value provided by different roles, tools & products
    • what could increase value of these
    • what’s missing
      – Informal feedback
  – Committee discuss/decide what changes
    (modifications, subtractions, additions) could be made
    • Via 1 or 2 conference calls

• Make recommendations at June meeting
Proposed Objectives

• Help improve center performance by collecting feedback from and performance data on important stakeholder groups (e.g., industry, faculty)

• Providing data-based analysis and advice to center management and NSF in a timely fashion
Sample: What could be done to improve the protocol

- Make evaluation tools shorter, more efficient and focused
- Get higher response rates & make feedback to director quicker
  - Industry P/O \rightarrow Industry feedback tool (one pager)
    - Provide LIFE form analysis:
  - Faculty P/O \rightarrow Faculty feedback; switch to students after year 5
  - Create alternative tools: focus group guides
- Continue to encourage and support periodic research projects that would be implemented program-wide