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Background and Goal

• Background
  – IUCRCs have recently exhibited some heterogeneity on how consortially they operate
  – Questions have also come up about the extent to which IUCRCs represent “team science” (e.g., multidisciplinary, team-based)

• Goals
  – Examine the extent to which IUCRCs exhibit fidelity to the consortial model
  – Examine the extent to which IUCRCs practice “team science”
  – Explore the relationships among these variables
Methodology

• Questionnaire
  – Completed by evaluator rating center practices and operations (e.g. meeting attendance)
  – N=48

• Merged with archival data
  – Structural data
  – Process/Outcome data
Which of the following best describes how this multi-site center operates:

- Center-based: 48.9%
- Mostly Center-based: 36.2%
- Site-based: 14.9%
Estimate the percentage of total IAB who physically attended this meeting:

- 0-20%: 45.8%
- 21-40%: 6.3%
- 41-60%: 20.8%
- 61-80%: 22.9%
- 81-100%: 4.2%
If face-to-face meeting, which of the following best describes the attendance at the meeting:

- Equal attendance across sites (66.7%)
- Host site dominant attendance (18.8%)
- Other (14.6%)
Which of the following new project decision-making procedures best describes how new research proposals are selected/approved at this center:

- Consortial: 70.8%
- Site-based Consortial: 12.5%
- Modified Member-based: 12.5%
- Member-based: 4.2%
Which of the following statements best describes how this center provides project results to their dues-paying IAB members:

- Results Dissemination

- 75.0% Consortial
- 22.9% Modified member-based
- 2.1% Member-based
Please check the response that most accurately describes the estimated frequency of collaborative projects (project involving multiple PIs) within this center.
Predictive Analyses

Preliminary Findings
Question?

- What are the consequences of operating at varying degrees of fidelity?
  - Does it have implications for structural outcomes?
  - Does it have implications for factors measured by the process/outcome questionnaire or fidelity questionnaire (e.g. multidisciplinarity)?
Methodology

• Creating Fidelity Scale
  – Dichotomize Q2 (decision making), 15 (project selection) & 16 (results dissemination)
    • 1 = high fidelity
    • 0 – low fidelity
  – Sum across those variables so that the fidelity scale ranges from 0 to 3

• Predictive Analyses
  – Bivariate correlations, for now…
### Significant Correlates with Fidelity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fidelity</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % Members Physically Attending</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % Projects Interested</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % CD time spent teaching</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Members Added</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.63**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Members Dropped</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>-0.44**</td>
<td>-0.45**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N reported along the diagonal; * $p < .05$, **$p < .01$

*Caution: we evaluated about 50 bivariate correlations.*