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REPORT PROCESSING & DATA ISSUES

This report provides basic descriptive statistics on the evaluator Process Outcome Questionnaire. Data was collected during the fall of 2001 and refers to the center activity for FY 2000-2001.

Since most evaluators use this report to benchmark their center compared to a program-wide “norm”, we have reported “center-level” means and standard deviations. Means for each center were used to calculate a center-level mean and are therefore unweighted aggregate means. Because questions that require a numeric answer (e.g. number of dollars) often have highly skewed distributions, we also reported the medians for these variables. For forced choice questions, frequencies and standard deviations for individual respondents were also reported.

Question #6 on the Industrial Member survey (the number of new projects supported by industry and the dollar value of these projects) was reported in three ways. First, we reported the center-level mean, median, and standard deviation for all respondents. Second, we reported a center level mean, median, and standard deviation only for those who reported supporting at least one new project. Finally, an average cost per project was calculated from the figures obtained for those reporting at least one new project.

Data for the Industry Short Questionnaire is presented in the same format as the regular Industry Questionnaire. This questionnaire is for use with centers that have surpassed five years of funding (refer to Evaluator’s Notebook, section 3.2.1). Since both the industry long and industry short questionnaires share some of the same questions, data for these shared questions was pooled for analysis. These questions are marked in the report with a *.
## RESPONSE RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Center Level</th>
<th>Individual Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Frequency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population(^a)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers Excused from Evaluation(^b,c)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Population</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers who did not return P/O Data</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Received</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received / Population</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>38.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received / Available Population</td>
<td>59.46%</td>
<td>51.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received / Sample</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>86.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Population was defined as centers that were at least 1 year old.
\(^b\) One center did not have an evaluator.
\(^c\) Centers were excused for reasons such as being in the last year of funding, the center was restructuring, and an alternative evaluation was used.

## LONG INDUSTRY FORM VS. SHORT INDUSTRY FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Long Form</th>
<th>Short Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of items</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of questions in common</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of unique questions</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of centers using form</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>