

LIFE DISCUSSION SURVEY RESULTS

EVALUATORS KNOWLEDGE BASE PROJECT
DREW RIVERS, LINDSEY MCGOWEN, DENIS GRAY,
CONNIE CHANG (PRESENTER)

NSF I/UCRC ANNUAL EVALUATORS' MEETING
NSF Stafford I Building, Room 375
4201 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia
Day One, June 11, 2015

Survey on “LIFE Form Review & Discussion”

- ✦ Evaluators KB project team designed a short survey on “LIFE Form Review & Discussion”
 - Purpose – to gain an understanding of cross-center practices in administering the LIFE forms at semiannual IAB workshops and discussing LIFE form results
- ✦ Email with link to Qualtrics survey sent to all Center Evaluators immediately after scheduled semi-annual IAB workshop (January to May 2015)
- ✦ Received 44 completed responses
- ✦ Survey results aggregated, some reported here today, and all to be incorporated in the Evaluators KB

Some highlights, 1/7

- ✦ 88.64% responded that the meeting agenda included a “LIFE Form Review and Discussion”
- ✦ Nearly 3 in 4 (72.73%) responded that they found the LIFE Form Review and Discussion to be “Very Effective” (29.55%) or “Effective” (43.18%) in terms of helping to align research projects with IAB interests
- ✦ Minutes scheduled for “LIFE Form Review and Discussion” ranged between 15 minutes and 90 minutes
 - Duration of actual minutes spent was mostly as scheduled

Some highlights, 2/7

- ✦ 1 in 3 respondents (34.88%) said the LIFE Form Review and Discussion were held on the SAME DAY as project presentations
- ✦ Nearly 2 in 3 respondents (62.79%) held it the DAY AFTER
 - Question – If held on the SAME DAY, can center evaluators share what is different about the way the discussion is designed compared to the DAY AFTER?

Some highlights, 3/7

- ✦ Median number of “projects inputted” into the LIFE system = 12
- ✦ 1 in 5 (20%) reported inputting 20 or more projects
 - Question – Can center evaluators share the process by which the center handles 20+ project presentations and the subsequent LIFE discussion? Were presentation times generally shorter and more pre-planning involved? Was there a process for down-selection?

Some highlights, 4/7

- ✦ 3 out of 5 (61.36%) report that LIFE discussions (excluding project voting or selection) were open to faculty and research scientists
- ✦ Nearly 1 out of 5 (15.91%) were closed door with only IAB and center directors present
- ✦ Nearly 1 out of 5 (15.91) report Other
 - Closed, industry + NSF + center MD (no other directors)
 - Part 1: Closed, IAB + NSF only; Part 2: Whole-group report + discussion
 - Closed for discussion, then open to just directors at end

Some highlights, 5/7

- ✦ Nearly 3 in 4 (70.45%) responded that the Evaluator had primary responsibility for “moderating” the discussion
 - 36.36% responded that the IAB Chair moderated
 - 11.36% responded Someone Else
 - IAB member chosen by Center leaders
 - Managing Director
 - Each IAB focus group chair led the discussion for his/her project
 - Student
 - 6.82% responded the Center Director or Site Director

Some highlights, 6/7

- ✦ Only 1 in 4 (27.27%) responded the Evaluator had primary responsibility for the “technical discussion”
 - 27.27% responded the IAB Chair
 - 20.45% responded the Center Director or a Site Director
 - 15.91% responded a different IAB member for each project
 - 15.91% responded a faculty PI or the PI for each project
 - 11.36% responded Someone Else
 - Managing Director who is also a technical expert
 - Primary project mentor
 - Researchers answered questions
 - Students select specific comments/questions and respond to the top ones

Some highlights, 7/7

- ✦ One elaboration on what's working (or not working) reads,

“Generally the LIFE summary review is working ... Often the members are rather quiet and it takes some effort to get them engaged in the discussions. Earlier this year at another meeting I recruited industry attendees before the LIFE review to summarize and lead discussions of the technical comments/questions during the LIFE review. This went very well and I plan to use this model in the future. But it does require some pre-planning and coordination at the meeting.”

- Question – How are the technical leads chosen in centers where others (not the center evaluator) lead the “LIFE Form Review and Discussion”?
- Question – What other methods are employed to ensure robust IAB LIFE discussions?

Other questions? Future work?

- ✦ Other questions?
- ✦ Future work ... what knowledge capture, practices shared, or other info would be helpful to center evaluators? NSF?
- ✦ Feel free to talk to us – Drew, Lindsey, Denis, or me