
Evaluators' Breakout II:

**REVISITING EVALUATING THE
EVALUATOR**

10:00 - 11:15 am

Friday, January 12, 2007

**2007 ANNUAL MEETING
Arlington, Virginia**

***INDUSTRY / UNIVERSITY COOPERATIVE
RESEARCH CENTERS PROGRAM***

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION



EVALUATING THE EVALUATOR

ERIC SUNDSTROM

**NSF IUCRC Evaluator
University of Tennessee**

&

DENIS GRAY

**NSF IUCRC Evaluation Program
North Carolina State University**

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
-

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 → Industry feedback tool (one pager)
 - Provide LIFE form analysis:
 - Faculty P/O → 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
-