

**National Science Foundation  
Industry/University  
Cooperative Research Centers**



***FINAL***

***June 2012***

***2010-2011 Process Outcome Survey Results***

***Descriptive Statistics Compiled from Industry and Faculty Surveys***

***D.O. Gray, S.E. DeYoung, O. Leonchuk, & L.C. McGowen  
Department of Psychology  
Psychology in the Public Interest Program  
North Carolina State University***

***Note: Please do not quote or cite without permission of the authors***

## CONTENTS

### Overview

Report Processing & Data Issues	2
Response Rates	3
Long Faculty Form vs. Short Faculty Form	3

### Industry Results

Table 1: Research Program	4
Table 2: Benefits	5
Table 3: Center Administration and Operations	7
Table 4: General Evaluation	7

### Faculty Results

8

## **REPORT PROCESSING & DATA ISSUES**

This report provides descriptive statistics on the IUCRC Process Outcome Questionnaires. Data were collected during the Fall of 2011 and refer to the Center activity for FY 2010-2011.

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, with the exception of question #5 on the Industry Questionnaire (see below). That is, means (unweighted) for each center were used to calculate a Center-level mean. 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.

### ***Industry Questionnaires***

All data were collected using a single industry questionnaire form; the short and long versions of industry questionnaires used in past data collection are no longer utilized.<sup>1</sup>

Beginning with the 2006-7 report, question #6 on the Industry Questionnaire (the dollar value of center-stimulated projects) has been reported based on forced choice categories. This change was made to avoid coding problems and ambiguities raised with open-ended answers. Descriptive statistics for this question are reported three ways: member-level, center-level and IUCRC Program-level. Also, we report an individual-level mean, median, and standard deviation for dollar value for cases reporting at least one project. Because unweighted center means were highly skewed and misleading, individual-level data were used to calculate these statistics.

### ***Faculty Questionnaires***

The faculty questionnaire includes two versions: a long version (13 items) that is used by centers in year 1-5 and a short version (6 items) that is used by centers in year 6-10<sup>2</sup>. Since both the faculty long and faculty short questionnaires share some of the same questions, data for these shared questions were pooled for analysis. In the tables below, questions only included in the long version are noted as follows: (L).

---

<sup>1</sup> The industry questionnaire was revised as of 2006-2007 data collection. *The current industry questionnaire has been significantly shortened (from 44 (L) and 27 (S) to 16 questions).*

<sup>2</sup> The faculty questionnaire was revised as of 2006-2007 data collection. The primary changes made include: some questions used in past questionnaires were dropped (old version was 29 questions), and two versions of the faculty questionnaire were created.

## RESPONSE RATES

Category	Center Level		Individual Level	
	Industry	Faculty	Industry	Faculty
<b><i>Response Frequency</i></b>				
Continuing Population from CD report	49	49	936	805
1 <sup>st</sup> Year Reporting Population from CD report	+0	+0	+0	+0
Retired/Defunct Centers <sup>a</sup>	5	5	46	34
Retired/Defunct Centers Reporting <sup>b</sup>	+2	+1	+16	+20
Phase III Centers Reporting <sup>c</sup>	+3	+2	+19	+25
Population <sup>d</sup>	49	47	925	816
Centers Excused from Evaluation <sup>e</sup>	1	1	15	17
Centers that did not return data	0	3	0	79
Available Population <sup>f</sup>	48	43	910	720
Data Received	48	43	360	298
Received / Population	97.99%	91.49%	38.92%	36.52%
Received / Available Population	100%	100%	39.56%	41.39%

- a. This year one center retired more than a year ago reported data. However since they have been out of the program for more than a year, no individual frequencies were available for response rates. This center is included in the “retired/defunct centers reporting” row, but not in the “retired/defunct centers” row.
- b. Retired/defunct Centers are not required to submit data, but some do submit some data. If relevant, those data were included in the analysis.
- c. For Phase III Centers entering the program in 2011, process outcome data collection is optional. The current solicitation does not provide that option. Phase III Centers entering after 2011 are included in the continuing population.
- d. Population was defined as centers that were at least 1 year old.
- e. Centers were excused for reasons such as being in the midst of center restructuring and respondent refusal to complete surveys.
- f. Numbers based on population minus excused and not returned counts.

## LONG FACULTY FORM VS. SHORT FACULTY FORM

	Long Form	Short Form
# of items	13	6
# of questions in common	6	6
# of unique questions	7	0
# of Centers using form	28	20
Sample size	185	113

# Industry Results: 2010-2011

**Table 1: Research Program**

1. What percentage of Center research projects do you take an active interest in?											<b>Center Level</b>	
0-19%		20-39%		40-59%		60-79%		80-100%		Missing Data		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)								
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
65	18.6	82	23.5	92	26.4	82	23.5	28	8.0	11	2.79	0.64

3. During the past year, how satisfied were you with the following features of the Center's research program?

	<b>Individual Frequencies</b>											<b>Center Level</b>	
	Not Satisfied		Slightly Satisfied		Somewhat satisfied		Quite Satisfied		Very Satisfied		Missing Data		
	1	2	3	4	5								
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
a. Capabilities of the researchers & quality of the research program*	0.0	0.0	4	1.2	44	12.8	186	53.9	111	32.1	15	4.14	0.40
b. Breadth of the research topics covered	1	0.3	17	4.9	73	21.2	174	50.6	79	23.0	16	3.92	0.45
c. Focus of the research	2	0.6	19	5.5	75	21.9	177	51.6	70	20.4	17	3.88	0.44
d. Relevance of research to my organization's needs*	3	0.9	34	9.9	84	24.5	162	47.2	60	17.5	17	3.70	0.42

\* Item presented for the first time on the 2006-2007 Industry Questionnaire

**Table 2: Benefits**

5. During the past year, approximately how many Center-stimulated research projects were supported by your organization (include internal projects and projects contracted to outside performers)? Please estimate the dollar value of all Center-stimulated research projects. Exclude Center membership fee.

<b>Member Level Scores</b>	<b><u>Member Level</u></b>		
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
<b>Includes All Cases</b>			
a. Number of center-stimulated research projects per respondent organization <i>Sample: N of members = 305 ; N of centers = 46</i>	1.62	1.00	1.91
b. Average dollar value of center-stimulated projects (in thousands) per respondent organization <i>Sample: all respondents: N of members = 307 ; N of Centers= 45</i>	152.74	50.00	271.63
<b>Includes Only Cases Citing 1 or more projects</b>			
c. Number of center-stimulated research projects per respondent organization <i>Sample: N of members = 223; N of Centers = 47</i>	2.21	2.00	1.92
d. Average dollar value of center-stimulated projects (in thousands) per respondent organization <i>Sample: N of members = 204 ; N of Centers = 44</i>	215.05	100.00	282.13
e. Average dollar value of each center-stimulated project (in thousands) <i>Sample: N of members = 204; N of Centers = 44</i>	107.46	50.00	129.60
<b>Center Level Scores</b>	<b><u>Center Level</u></b>		
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
<b>Includes All Cases</b>			
f. Number of center-stimulated research projects per center <i>Sample: N of members = 305 ; N of Centers = 46</i>	10.72	9.00	8.39
g. Average dollar value of center-stimulated projects (in thousands) per center <i>Sample: all respondents: N of members 307 = ; N of Centers= 45</i>	997.66	770.00	895.56
<b>Program Level Scores</b>	<b><u>Program Level</u></b>		
h. Total number of center stimulated projects supported by respondent organizations <i>Sample: N of members = 223 ; N of Centers = 47</i>	493		
i. Total dollar value of center-stimulated projects supported by respondent organizations <i>Sample: all respondents: N of members = 204 ; N of Centers= 44</i>	\$46,890,000		

\* It is worth noting that since only 39.56% of all members completed the questionnaire; this is a very conservative estimate of the value of center stimulated projects supported by members.

6. During the past year, how many students trained in the Center projects were hired by your organization?

*Sample: N of members = 338; N of centers = 47*

<b>Member Level Scores</b>	<b><u>Member Level</u></b>	
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>
a. Average number of students hired per respondent organization	0.30	0.82
<b>Center Level Scores</b>		
b1. Average number of students hired per respondent organization per center	0.31	0.51
b2. Average number of students hired by respondent organizations per center	1.98	2.79
<b>Program Level Scores</b>	<b><u>Program Level</u></b>	
c. Total number of students hired by respondent organizations	93	

7. During the past year, to what extent has participation in the Center contributed to the following benefits for your organization?

	<u>Individual Frequencies</u>													<u>Center Level</u>	
	No Impact		Slight Impact		Moderate Impact		High Impact		Very High Impact		N/A		Missing Data	Mean	S.D.
	1	2	3	4	5	9	N	%	N	%	N	%			
<b>a. Research &amp; Development:</b> Enhanced via increased technical awareness, accelerated or new projects or development of intellectual property in my organization	25	7.4	68	20.2	115	34.2	82	24.4	37	11.0	9	2.8	21	2.98	0.69
<b>b. Commercialization:</b> Enhanced via improved or new products, processes, services, improved sales, or new or retained jobs.	102	30.7	95	28.6	64	19.3	23	7.0	8	2.4	40	12.0	20	2.02	0.65
<b>c. Professional Networking:</b> Enhanced via improved ability to recruit students, increased cooperation with other industrial members and scientists outside my organization	21	6.3	49	14.6	110	32.6	93	27.7	51	15.2	12	3.6	19	3.20	0.66

\* For 7a-c the N's for response rate as 9(N/A) were included in the frequency calculations but not in calculations of the mean for those items.

**Table 3: Center Administration and Operations**

9. During the past year, how satisfied were you with center administrative operations?												
<b>Individual Frequencies</b>											<b>Center Level</b>	
Not Satisfied (1)		Slightly Satisfied (2)		Satisfied (3)		Quite Satisfied (4)		Very Satisfied (5)		Missing Data		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
2	0.6	8	2.4	52	15.4	177	52.5	98	29.1	23	4.05	0.47

**Table 4: General Evaluation**

11. Will your organization renew its membership?												
<b>Individual Frequencies</b>											<b>Center Level</b>	
Definitely Not (1)		Probably Not (2)		Uncertain (3)		Probably Yes (4)		Definitely Yes (5)		Missing Data		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
3	0.9	3	0.9	58	17.3	156	46.4	116	34.5	24	4.07	0.42

13. Organization Type/Size

	<b>Individual Frequencies</b>	
	N	%
1. For-Profit Large (> 500 employees)	211	58.6
2. For-Profit Small (< 500 employees)	69	19.2
3. Non-Profit/Government	65	18.1
Missing Data	12	4.1



# Faculty Results: 2010-2011

**Table 1: Research**

1. Compared to the research projects that you typically conduct outside the Center, would you describe your Center funded research as: (L)\*

<b>Individual Frequencies</b>										<b>Center Level</b>		
Much more basic (1)		More basic (2)		Same (3)		More Applied (4)		Much more applied (5)		Missing Data*		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
2	1.1	7	3.8	73	40.1	85	46.7	15	8.3	3	3.52	0.46

\* Indicates a question that is unique to the long version of the faculty questionnaire.

2. During the past year, how satisfied were you with the following?

	<b>Individual Level</b>											<b>Center Level</b>	
	Not Satisfied (1)		Slightly Satisfied (2)		Somewhat Satisfied (3)		Quite Satisfied (4)		Very Satisfied (5)		Missing Data		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean	S.D.
a. Quality of the Center-supported research program	1	0.3	6	2.0	30	10.1	126	42.4	134	45.2	1	4.31	0.42
b. Relevance of the Center's research program to my professional goals	2	0.7	6	2.0	23	7.8	110	37.2	155	52.3	2	4.36	0.35

**Table 2: Impact**

4. During the past year, what impact has participation in the Center had for YOU in the following areas? (L)*														
	<b>Individual Level</b>											<b>Center Level</b>		
	No Impact (1)		Somewhat Positive Impact (2)		Moderately Positive Impact (3)		Very Positive Impact (4)		Extremely Positive Impact (5)		Missing Data	N	Mean	S.D.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
a. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the research I do.	9	4.9	10	5.5	25	13.8	91	50.3	46	25.5	4	3.82	0.43	
b. Opportunities for research contracts/grants.	11	6.0	10	5.5	32	17.5	82	44.8	48	26.2	2	3.76	0.48	
c. Recognition I receive for the work I do.	8	4.4	14	7.7	44	24.2	76	41.7	40	22.0	3	3.64	0.45	
d. Access to useful equipment.	42	23.3	9	5.0	48	26.7	47	26.1	34	18.9	5	3.15	0.88	
e. Ability to support graduate students.	11	6.0	10	5.5	26	14.2	63	34.4	73	39.9	2	3.99	0.65	
f. Ability to publish my work in quality proceedings and journals.	19	10.4	14	7.7	42	23.1	67	36.8	40	22.0	3	3.52	0.68	

\* Indicates a question that is unique to the long version of the faculty questionnaire.

**Table 3: Commitment**

5. Which option best expresses your current intentions?														
	<b>Individual Frequencies</b>											<b>Center Level</b>		
	Definitely Not (1)		Probably Not (2)		Uncertain (3)		Probably Yes (4)		Definitely Yes (5)		Missing Data	N	Mean	S.D.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
Next year I will submit my best research ideas in a center funded proposal*	2	0.7	11	3.7	44	14.9	109	36.8	130	43.9	2	4.22	0.41	

\* Item presented for the first time on the 2006-2007 Faculty Questionnaire

**Table 4: Satisfaction**

6. During the past year, how satisfied were you with center administrative operations?														
	<b>Individual Frequencies</b>											<b>Center Level</b>		
	Not Satisfied (1)		Slightly Satisfied (2)		Somewhat Satisfied (3)		Quite Satisfied (4)		Very Satisfied (5)		Missing Data	N	Mean	S.D.
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
	1	0.3	6	2.1	31	10.6	109	37.3	145	49.7	6	4.32	0.47	