

Comment:

Comment	If you indicated in the FUNDING AND MEMBERSHIP section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.
Yr 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Center Director concentrating on membership recruitment. ● Fall '01 - Organization meeting planned. Potential members being invited. ● Planning fall-winter reorganization, strategic research meeting -- '01 ● The Center Director, with help from the IAB members, is vigorously trying to recruit new members for the Center. Mergers and acquisitions make such action necessary. ● This is a transition year with Director turnover and restructuring. NSF is aware of the reduced membership and is reviewing the Center's ability to turn it around. ● N/A ● Center has never made the criterion since its second year of operations. Original director left TAMU and it never maintained after that.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems fro a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● Alex is looking into this issue. Lead University is the issue. ● The Director and site Directorsof the Center are actively recruiting new memberships. ● Marketing message tailored to both IAB scientists as well as the supervisors who sign the check. A fast track project approval process that lets new members choose and quickly start the project they want. Networking with IAB members for promising leads. Participation in new state-industry research initiatives. Potential addition of another University site. ● Center Director is actively pursuing new membership companies. ● Regarding \$300K; this is a new Center and there are >\$300K in membership committments, but the Center is still collecting membership fees against invoices. I am not sure that all companies have paid their first year fee thus far. ● MCEC - Measurement & Control Engineering Center - at University of Tennessee & Oklahoma State University - lost members, couldn't recruit more, is closing this year. Didn't get needed line-of-credit from UT, had to pay for its admin position and even accounting. Good support from OSU though. ● Membership way down. Needs constant reminders. ● Membership is WAY down.

Comment	If you indicated in the POLICY AND PROCEDURES section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.
Yr 2001	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IP has always been a problematic area. Just instituted a new policy that allows for exclusive licenses. This got us in trouble; with Alex but the problem has been worked out (temporarily). ● N/A ● Center never followed the IAB model. Firm's contribution is earmarked for the work of a specific faculty member. No real joint decision-making about projects, ever.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems fro a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● Fees, being looked at now. ● This Center is starting to use required structure etc. but not in full compliance yet. By Fall meeting it will be. ● IAB chair needs clearer definition; Director role a little vague. Research reports get fairly casual handling at CAPCE - need better security on posters; PowerPoint presentations need to be marked confidential Corrective action: Will repeat earlier guidance to Directors & adm. assistants. ● Some IP issues in the membership agreement are in question by some members. I am not sure if these have been totally resolved yet. ● Had to nag about non-disclosure agreements for visitors - a function of turnover in Director & Coordinator jobs ● Center tends to be more of a one-man operation rather than a team of faculty. ● Center tends to be run more informally than most. Not clear companies really know which projects are theirs and which are supported by state and other sources.

Comment	If you indicated in the CENTER MEETINGS section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ensure that ALL research projects has physical representation at meetings, not just posters. Request more time for evaluator to report to IAB other than just informal discussions. ● Poster Session hasn't happened yet, despite repeated, strong suggestions to the Director from me and Alex. Plan to continue the strong suggestions. ● Alex has approved 1 meeting per year for this center due to slow pace of research. Results of surveys are discussed with site directors and IAB chair. ● Finds are presented to center director and included in the ER report. There hasn't been time or interest in presenting the results to the IAB ● Center has numerous members and numerous projects and is a multi-university Center. This combination makes it difficult to discuss all projects in detail. Subject is an agenda item for the next Evaluators' meetin-June 2006. ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems fro a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● IAB members take full direction from the Center on all research projects. Seem to have exceptional trust that the expertise in research lies with the Center. Nevertheless, they are not afraid to state their opinions and the exchanges between the Center and IAB members is very similar to that which takes place between faculty and students in PhD seminars. Other comments close focus on issues that this Center has not yet come into compliance with--each meeting we get closer. ● Evaluator needs to develop IAB outcomes briefing. ● Evaluator needs to develop IAB Outcomes briefing. ● Evaluator needs to develop IAB Outcomes briefing. ● 1. Evaluator presents research findings from NSF-IUCRC Outcomes Faculty & Industry Surveys annually to the IAB: No formal presentation of findings. Instead, I discuss highlights and insights from the data as appropriate during closed IAB meetings and one-on-one conversations. LIFE 2000 Form is not used, but a modified feedback form is used during the IAB meeting, with copies going immediately to the research and Center Director for review and feedback to IAB members at social events. This form was based on the original LIFE form but has additional questions added by both the IAB and the faculty to give additional input for the mentor meetings. 3. LIFE feedback is discussed during the IAB business meeting and projects are being recast as appropriate. Facilitation duties are split between the Evaluator and the IAB chair.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CAPCE IAB members don't all attend, company reps change often, individuals who attend may not know all of the expectations of the IAB role in relation to the whole Center agenda. Corrective action: Maybe a new members-attend-please incantation? ● Will present most recent outcome data at next IAB meeting in May. Have not done this consistently in the past. ● RE: Research Agenda: as a new Center, the process of suggesting, proposing and selecting new projects is in place, but is being adjusted. RE: Outcomes Faculty & Industry Surveys: Within first year of operation; have not done a survey yet. ● not immediately ● More membership will lead to more 'correct' meetings ● Given number of projects in this center no need to do posters. ● Center has too few projects to do posters. ● This director spends about 2-3 hours on LIFE feedback. Very impressive and informative; helps research planning ● Center doesn't think IP is much of an issue to members. ● Life happens generally but sometimes with too little time to do right.
--	---

Comment	<p>If you indicated in the UNIVERSITY SUPPORT section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.</p>
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Priorities at University level have drifted to other initiatives. Need more significant multidisciplinary projects ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems from a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● I believe that the universities at each site do these things but I don't know for sure. ● UT College of Engineering had to be pushed for every bit of support, often resisted and sometimes declined to provide support ● Director recruits faculty ● Most investigators have much larger funding sources that support their infrastructure.

Comment	If you indicated in the CENTER OPERATIONS section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reimbursement for expenses, such as travel, has taken far too long. Example, reimbursement for Evaluator travel to the Jan 2006 NSF meeting has not been made as of April 7, 2006 ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems from a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● This applies only to the lead university. Where accounting problems have surfaced and are being addressed by Central Administration with knowledge by Alex ● Recruiting new members: The Center is just now developing an ongoing continuing program for recruitment. ● Part-time Director job didn't allow needed continuity in recruiting. Bureaucratic accounting arrangement gave slow, often inaccurate numbers, a huge time-sink and source of frustration for the Directors. ● Recruiting is pretty adhoc and a new interim director is trying to ramp up.

Comment	If you indicated in the SPONSOR PRACTICES AND OUTCOMES section that the center is Not Using OR is Close, but Needs major Push on any of the practices, please indicate the corrective action planned.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Board consists of technical experts who actively tailor the research to their organizations' needs. So far, all IAB meetings have included explicit, strategic discussions. Center is too new to have graduates. ● Unknown ● This is CIPs first year. Iowa State doing well. The unknown stems fro a total lack of communication from New Jersey. ● Often VPs come to the meeting instead of technical experts. This poses somewhat of a problem in evaluating LIFE forms. ● Technical monitoring at CAPCE happens mainly month-to-month, outside IAB meetings, in close contact with the researchers, at the University sites. ● Center is in its fourth year; two new sites have been added in last year; an additional site will likely be added in the current year. Center has not yet revised its research focus. Probably a good idea to do next year after all sites have settled in. Open to suggestions or direction here. ● Not Using indicated because the Cener is less than a year old. ● Members invested as long as the research projects met their needs - started becoming problematic after Director job went part-time. ● Companies need a 'push' ● Research planning activities tend to be adhoc ● Center is new so some outcomes are ; haven't seen much systematic soliciting of input from center.

Comment	If you have any comments on the merits of the IUCRC Best Practices Checklist, or reservations about using it, please state them here. Also, if additional items come to mind, please write them here as well.
Yr 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Nice job on the questions!! ● I certainly hope the results of this form are confidential. In particular, I do not understand the reasons for such long delays for Evaluator reimbursement. Perhaps it is not institutional, merely inefficiency on the part of some employee? I have had this problem since administration for the Center changed to another university. ● I don't seem to have a copy of the best practice list. If you send one to me I'll share it with my director and IAB members and use to stimulate discussion of compliance at the next meeting in May. Send to dddavis@odu.edu ● For this Center, I have been the Evaluator just since November 2005, so I am about a few parctices.

- This is working very well