



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

IUCRC Evaluator Protocol: Update and Discussion

Overview



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

- Background
- Assumptions & Principles
- Summary of Revisions
- Industry & Faculty P/O
- LIFE Forms
- Other Options
- Questions/Discussion/Next Steps

An Aside – Collecting Center Structural Data



- Prior to 2007:
 - Center Structural Data collected via a web questionnaire created by a contractor.
 - » NCSU did request for participation, follow ups and extracted data
- 2006-7:
 - NCSU created excel modules each site could use to enter data and accumulate it at the center level
 - » System appears to be working well

Background



- Past discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of our evaluation effort (2006)
 - Making evaluation more useful
 - Response rate
 - Role of Advisor
 - Etc.
- Formed a committee to review and suggest changes (2006-7)
- Changes implemented (2007-8)

Assumptions



- Lot of things working
 - Improvement-focused evaluation emphasis
 - LIFE Form data is valuable for project decision making
- Some things not working as good
 - Questionnaire burden
 - Response rate
 - Timeliness of our feedback
- Leave some things alone, change others and come back and discuss some others

Enhancing the Value



Revision Principles

- Emphasize providing feedback that is timely and actionable
- Where possible and valuable maintain continuity of database for historical and longitudinal analysis purposes
- Be sensitive to data gathering burden placed on respondents without sacrificing value of information
- Changes should be work neutral for evaluators
 - If we drop significant activities, should try to add other value adding activities

Summary of Revisions



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

Evaluation Component	Change
Evaluation Goals	Written and posted: emphasize documenting outcomes, continuous improve
Evaluation Report	Continue as is
Targeted Studies	Continue to solicit
Industry P/O	Shortened: went from long (44) and short (27) to short-short (16)
Faculty P/O	Shortened; two versions: went from long (29) to short (Y 1-5: 13) and very short (Y 5-10: 6)
Exit Interviews	Meyer and Scott assessment
LIFE	Consider exploiting as research instrument
Other	Consider activities that add value

Industry P/O



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

Implementation

- Paper Questionnaire
 - Few used old version
 - » Get questionnaire from website!!!
- Changes
 - Forced choice for “Follow-on Funding” Question
 - » Fewer coding questions
 - » Formatting for “Number of Projects” question causing missing data
 - » Will reformat
- Response Rate
 - ~47-51%
- Questions, concerns, suggestions
 - Did we have a win?
 - What can we do to make this work better

Faculty P/O



Implementation

- Paper Questionnaire & NCSU hosted web-version
 - In small centers neither being used; few use web
- Changes
 - Two versions: no real problems
 - No obvious question problems
- Response rate
 - ~45-49%
- Questions, Concerns, Suggestions
 - Did we have a win?
 - What can we do to make this work better?

LIFE Forms



- As currently used LIFE forms provide information that helps IAB and director decide on project funding priorities
- With modest analysis effort LIFE data may also provide information about member satisfaction and investment in the center
- Feedback on center-level LIFE form could be provided immediately

Example



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

WICAT Spring Meeting, 2008
Summary of Level of Interest Feedback for Participating Member Firms

Project/PI	AM&DEC			BAE			MOTOROLA			NEPTUNE			PHILIPS			QUALCOM			ROCKWELL			SPACE			SYRACUSE			TYCO					
	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N	I	C	N			
RFIC Design/Dai	X				X			X	X		X	X		X	X		X		X			X			X								X
Path Select/Mao		X	X		X			X	X		X	X		X	X		X		X		X	X				X	X		X	X			
Collab Robots/Wilson	X			X			X		X	X				X	X		X		X		X	X				X			X	X			
Power CR/He		X			X	X	X		X	X		X		X			X		X		X				X			X		X			
Equaliz./ Ramkumar			X		X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X		X		X		X				X				X	X			
CORNET/Chen			X		X	X	X		X	X		X		X		X		X							X		X	X		X			
Tree Algo/Redard	X			X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X			X			X					X				X				
Usercontrol/Czarnecki		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X					X				X	X			
Reconfig/ Pedraza		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X					X			X		X			
User Secure/Sazena		X		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X						X	X		X	X			
Cooperative/Panwar		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X					X		X	X		X			
Layered/Alay		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X					X		X	X		X			
Total	3	3	6	5	1	6	7	1	4	9	1	2	2	1	9	3	8	0	4	4	4	3	0	0	7	2	3	7	0	4			

I = Interested; C = Interested with Change; N = Not Interested

Note: two forms filled out by BAE were reconciled into one rating.

Feedback



- Would such an analysis provide value to directors?
- Should we make a LIFE form analysis part of the evaluation responsibilities?
- If so, what could be done to support this effort

Other Issues



- Consider exploring methods for using more qualitative methods for collecting data
 - Target one “technology breakthrough” each year
- Consider Student P/O based on Jennifer Schneider’s work in year 6-10



Industry/University
Cooperative
Research Centers

Discussion