

**Office of
Planning and Institutional Effectiveness
Institutional Research**



Research Report 2001-04
Evaluation Survey By Clients
Spring 2001

University Park Campus
PC 543
Miami, FL 33199
Telephone: (305) 348-2731 Fax: (305) 348-1908
www.fiu.edu/~opie/cqis/index.htm

Office of Planning & Institutional Effectiveness

The Evaluation Survey By Clients is one survey in the series of Continuous Quality Improvement Surveys instituted by Florida International University's Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. This is the first survey report for the Evaluation Survey By Clients, and the fourth Continuous Quality Improvement Survey report. The information in these Continuous Quality Improvement Survey Reports will be distributed to members of the university community and will be used by the appropriate departments to enhance continuous quality improvement efforts.

Every effort has been made to ensure that the data contained in this document is accurate. For further information about this and other Continuous Quality Improvement Survey Reports, visit our website at www.fiu.edu/~opie/cqis/index.htm or contact our office at 305-348-2731, (FAX) 305-348-1908, or visit us at University Park PC 543.

Clarice D. Evans is responsible for the survey distribution, data tabulation and analyses and report writing for the Continuous Quality Improvement Surveys. Please contact her at evansc@fiu.edu if you have questions about the information contained in this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	1
Executive Summary of Evaluation Survey By Clients Spring 2001	2
Summary of the Evaluation Survey By Clients Spring 2001:	
Introduction	4
Methodology:	
Sampling Design	4
Response Rates	4
Statistics	5
Table 1. Local, State, National Agencies/Organizations and Educational Institutions Included in Client Survey Sample	5
Appendix A: Evaluation Survey By Clients	6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVALUATION SURVEY BY CLIENTS SPRING 2001

As a research university, it is vitally important for Florida International University to elicit contract and grant monies in support of faculty and staff research. Quality research by faculty/staff at FIU can lead to international recognition, publications for the primary investigator(s), the amelioration of community problems facing South Florida, and an increase in future research funding. Quality research can also lead to higher standing in the academic community, high quality graduate applicants who wish to work with a specific faculty member, and can also increase the quality of undergraduate applicants. Therefore it is essential that FIU be competitive in obtaining sponsored research funds from a variety of local, state and national organizations. Not only is it important that FIU faculty receive contract and grant monies but it is also essential that the awarding organization be satisfied with the end product. If the organization has a professional working relationship with FIU employees, it is reasonable to expect future awards in terms of continued funding or the awarding of new contracts or grants.

This report summarizes the findings from the Florida International University *Evaluation Survey By Clients*, a Continuous Quality Improvement study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research. This survey was adapted from a prototype survey developed by the State University System (SUS) Accountability Committee on Survey Activity (Legg, Final Report, 1992). This survey was designed to measure client organizations satisfaction with and attitudes about Florida International University. The survey design assured each individual respondent of his or her anonymity in an attempt to facilitate candor.

Initially, the survey was e-mailed, faxed or mailed to 123 individuals, representing 60 different agencies and organizations. At least 14 of the individuals were no longer at the agency or organization. In addition, e-mails were received from 10 individuals at other agencies or organizations stating that they did not have the necessary information to complete the survey. Another contact person stated that the project had not been completed and therefore she could not complete an evaluation at this point, and several additional contact persons stated on the phone that they could not complete the survey for various reasons (e.g. did not have the time, the survey was not relevant to his or her organization, his or her organization did not have any record of awarding research monies to FIU, legal department advised against completing the survey, he had been transferred and no longer had access to project files). Of the remaining 30 agencies and organizations, responses were received from 12 of them. The individual response rate was very low at approximately ten percent (12/123); however, the agency response rate was 20%.

In the future, it is suggested that the survey be substantially revised, as the information requested was seemingly difficult to obtain at the agencies and organizations. In addition, a better system of distribution is advised. The survey should be sent to the organization immediately upon completion of the research, perhaps in conjunction with the final report issued to the funding agency or organization.

In general, it appears that most of the research funding that FIU is receiving is from national agencies and organizations, in particular the federal government. Thirteen percent of agencies/organizations were local, ten percent were state agencies/organizations, fifty-five percent were national agencies and organizations and about twenty-two percent of agencies and organizations were other educational institutions. Perhaps a greater effort should be made to

solicit research monies from state and local sources to better serve the South Florida community.

Overall, the evaluations were positive; however, the reader cannot draw conclusions because the number of returned surveys was so low. Generally, surveys are returned from individuals with polarized opinions – very positive or very negative. In particular, one of the organizations reported severe administrative problems with the primary investigator at FIU.

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION SURVEY BY CLIENTS SPRING 2001

INTRODUCTION

As a research university, it is vitally important for Florida International University to elicit contract and grant monies in support of faculty and staff research. Quality research by faculty/staff at FIU can lead to international recognition, publications for the primary investigator(s), the amelioration of community problems facing South Florida, and an increase in future research funding. Quality research can also lead to higher standing in the academic community, high quality graduate applicants who wish to work with a specific faculty member, and can also increase the quality of undergraduate applicants as well. Therefore it is essential that FIU be competitive in obtaining sponsored research funds from a variety of local, state and national organizations. Not only is it important that FIU faculty receive contract and grant monies but it is also essential that the awarding organization be satisfied with the end product. If the organization has a professional working relationship with FIU employees, it is reasonable to expect future awards in terms of continued funding or the awarding of new contracts or grants.

This report summarizes the findings from the Florida International University *Evaluation Survey By Clients*, a Continuous Quality Improvement study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research. This survey was adapted from a prototype survey developed by the State University System (SUS) Accountability Committee on Survey Activity (Legg, Final Report, 1992). This survey was designed to measure client organizations satisfaction with and attitudes about Florida International University. The survey design assured each individual respondent of his or her anonymity in an attempt to facilitate candor.

METHODOLOGY

Sampling Design. Surveys were distributed by e-mail, facsimile and mail to a selected list of contract/grant officers and project coordinators at organizations that recently completed a contract or grant term with an FIU faculty member/employee. The Office of Sponsored Research at FIU provided the list of contract/grant officers and project coordinators to the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness. Each individual was instructed to return the completed survey via e-mail, fax or the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided to him or her. In an effort to improve the response rate, each individual was contacted several additional times through e-mail and/or a phone call.

Response Rates. Initially, the survey was distributed to 123 individuals, representing 60 different agencies and organizations. At least 14 of the individuals were no longer at the agency or organization. In addition, e-mails were received from 10 individuals at other agencies or organizations stating that they did not have the necessary information to complete the survey. Another contact person stated that the project had not been completed and therefore she could not complete an evaluation at this time, and several additional contact persons stated on the phone that they could not complete the survey for various reasons (e.g. did not have the time, the survey was not relevant to his or her organization, his or her organization did not have any record of awarding research monies to FIU, legal department advised against completing the survey, he

had been transferred and no longer had access to project files). Of the remaining 30 agencies and organizations, responses were received from 12 of them. The individual response rate was very low at approximately ten percent (12/123); however, the agency response rate was 20%.

In the future, it is suggested that the survey be substantially revised, as the information requested was seemingly difficult to obtain at the agencies and organizations. In addition, a better system of distribution is advised. The survey should be sent to the organization immediately upon completion of the research, perhaps in conjunction with the final report issued to the funding agency or organization.

Statistics. The data were tabulated using Survey Pro 2.0. The percentages are reported for each question. Because of the small number of agencies that responded, it is impossible to perform additional statistical analyses. Table one indicates the number of local, state and national agencies and organizations and other educational institutions that were included in the survey sample, as well as the number of each that responded to the survey.

TABLE 1
Local, State, National Agencies/Organizations and Educational Institutions Included in Client Survey Sample

Type of Agency/Organization	# in Sample	Percent of Agencies/Organizations	Returned Client Survey	Response Rate by Type	Percent of Respondents
Local	8	13.3%	3	37.5%	27.2%
State	6	10.0%	1	16.7%	9.1%
National	33	55.0%	4	12.1%	33.3%
Educational Institution	13	21.7%	2	15.4%	18.2%
Unknown	<u>0</u>	-----	<u>2</u>	-----	<u>18.2%</u>
Totals	60	100.0%	12		100%

APPENDIX A:
Evaluation Survey By Clients

A. During a typical year, about how many new research contracts does your organization award?

Less than 5	41.7%	41 - 60	0.0%
5 - 10	16.7%	61 - 80	0.0%
11 - 20	0.0%	81 - 100	0.0%
21 - 40	0.0%	Over 100	41.7%

B. What is the approximate level of total annual research expenditures for your organizations?

Less than \$100,000	25.0%	\$600,000 - \$999,000	0.0%
\$100,000 - \$199,000	8.3%	\$1,000,000 - \$2,000,000	16.7%
\$200,000 - \$399,000	0.0%	\$2,000,001 - \$5,000,000	8.3%
\$400,000 - \$599,000	0.0%	Over \$5,000,000	41.7%

C. During a typical year, about what percent of your organization's new research contracts are awarded to Florida International University?

Under 5%	63.6%	21 - 30%	0.0%
6 - 10%	9.1%	31 - 50%	0.0%
11 - 20%	0.0%	Over 50%	27.3%

D. Please list the primary technical units at FIU with whom you contract (e.g. Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Computer Science, HCET, HPDRC, Instructional Programs, Psychology, Specific Engineering units).

Scientific Environmental Research Programs
 Marine Biology
 Mechanical Technical Center, Mechanical Engineering Department
 CLRS
 Biological Sciences
 Instructional Programs
 Institute of Government
 Department of Psychology
 Physics, Engineering Materials,
 Computer Science

E. In addition to units you listed in the previous question, please indicate all other FIU primary technical units or departments with which you award contracts:

Aerospace Engineering	20.0%	Exceptional & Physical Education	0.0%
Biological Sciences	20.0%	Health Sciences	20.0%
Career Resource Center	0.0%	Industrial Engineering	0.0%
Chemistry Department	0.0%	Instructional Programs	0.0%
Civil & Environmental Engineering	0.0%	IHC: International Hurricane Center	0.0%
Computer Engineering	0.0%	Mechanical Engineering	0.0%
Computer Science	20.0%	Office of Veteran's Affairs	0.0%
Criminal Justice	0.0%	Psychology Department	0.0%
Economics	0.0%	Physics Department	20.0%
Educational Foundations	0.0%	Political Science Department	0.0%

Educational Services	0.0%	Sociology & Anthropology	0.0%
Electrical & Computer Engineering	20.0%	Other	40.0%
F. In which of the following categories below do most of your research contracts fall?			
Aerospace	8.3%	Health Related	16.7%
Biological Systems & Processes	25.0%	Human Performance	8.3%
Chemical Systems & Processes	8.3%	Industrial Related	8.3%
Communications	0.0%	Manufacturing	8.3%
Criminal Justice	0.0%	Natural Resources	16.7%
Defense Related	0.0%	Political Related	8.3%
Educational Related	0.0%	Product Design	0.0%
Electrical	8.3%	Public Works	0.0%
Electronics	0.0%	Solid Hazardous Waste	0.0%
Energy	8.3%	Simulation	8.3%
Environmental	25.0%	Survey Research	16.7%
Management/Engineering	0.0%	Waste/Wastewater Management	0.0%
Government	25.0%	Other	25.0%

G. Please compare the quality of each product or service delivered by Florida International University to those of other academic institutions with which you contract.

	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Unable to Evaluate
Quality of the product	58.3%	8.3%	8.3%	25.0%
Quality of project reports	50.0%	16.7%	8.3%	25.0%
Meeting the time targeted	41.7%	50.0%	8.3%	0.0%
Willingness to cooperate	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ability to transfer its technology to client's needs	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%	50.0%
Presentation of results	50.0%	8.3%	25.0%	8.3%
Competence of Principal Investigators	66.7%	8.3%	8.3%	16.7%
Understanding of contract objectives	58.3%	16.7%	16.7%	8.3%
Research implementation plan	41.7%	16.7%	16.7%	25.0%
Quality of services provided by the Sponsored Research office	33.3%	16.7%	0.0%	50.0%
Cost effectiveness	33.3%	25.0%	8.3%	33.3%
Florida problems addressed (if applicable)	22.2%	22.2%	0.0%	55.6%

H. How responsive was FIU's primary technical unit in meeting your research expectations?

Very responsive	90.9%
Moderately responsive	9.1%
Not responsive	0.0%

I. How would you rank the overall research performance of FIU investigators relative to other institutional investigators with whom you contract?

Outstanding	45.5%	Somewhat lower	9.1%
Better	9.1%	Inferior	9.1%
Equivalent	27.3%		

J. Over the previous five years, about how many research contracts has your organization awarded to FIU?

1 - 4	66.7%	21 - 30	16.7%
5 - 10	16.7%	31 - 50	0.0%

11 - 20

0.0%

51 or more

0.0%

K. Over the previous five years, has the number of research contracts awarded to FIU tended to increase or decrease?

Increased considerably	10.0%	Decreased slightly	10.0%
Increased slightly	40.0%	Decreased considerably	0.0%
Stayed about the same	40.0%		

L. Please indicate the category that best describes your organization's primary type of business activity.

Accounting	0.0%	Government: Local	8.3%
Agriculture	0.0%	Legal Services	0.0%
Automotive	0.0%	Food, Bar	0.0%
Banking, Finance, Insurance	0.0%	Glass or Paper Packing	0.0%
Chemicals, Drugs	0.0%	Health Care, Hospitals, Homes	0.0%
Construction, Building Materials	0.0%	Hospitality, Hotel & Restaurant	0.0%
Consulting Services	0.0%	Mechanical Equipment	0.0%
Computers, Business Equipment	0.0%	Nonprofit (Museums, Agencies, etc.)	8.3%
Educational Institution	8.3%	Printing, Publishing	0.0%
Defense Contractor	0.0%	Research Organizations	16.7%
Electrical or Electronic Equipment	8.3%	Retail, Wholesale	0.0%
Environment, Natural Resources	0.0%	Service Industry	0.0%
Entertainment, Sports	0.0%	Textiles & Apparel	0.0%
Fishing	0.0%	Tourist Attractions	0.0%
Government: Federal	41.7%	United States Armed Services	8.3%
Government: State	8.3%	Utilities, Public Transportation	0.0%

M. Please indicate the status of the person(s) who responded to the questionnaire information:

Administrative personnel	66.7%
Technical personnel involved with the research project	8.3%
Combination of administrative and technical personnel	25.0%