

Engineering Research Center Institutional Partners Customer Satisfaction Survey

Pursuant to 5 CFR 1320.5(b), an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to an information collection unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 3145-0157. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 30 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions. Send comments regarding this burden estimate and any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to: Reports Clearance Officer, Facilities and Operations Branch, Division of Administrative Services, National Science Foundation, Arlington, VA 22230.

1. Welcome!

*1. Please describe your role in the NSF Engineering Research Center (ERC) program. Please indicate whether your institution is Minority-Serving and/or Female-Serving. (More than one response is possible.)

- Lead
- Core Partner
- Outreach Partner
- LSAMP/AGEP/CREST/Other NSF Diversity Awardee
- Other (please describe)
- Minority-Serving Institution
- Female-Serving Institution

Other (please describe)

2. Core Partner: Relationship with Lead ERC Institution

The following questions invite you to consider the programmatic, administrative, technical and communicative relationship your institution has with the Lead ERC Institution.

1. Your institution's overall relationship with the Lead ERC Institution is mutually beneficial.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Please comment as desired.

2. Your overall expectation of the Lead ERC Institution.

The Lead ERC Institution meets our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution exceeds our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution does not meet our expectations.

Please comment as desired.

3. The level of support provided by The Lead ERC Institution.

The support level is commensurate with my institution's contributions.

The support level exceeds my institution's contributions.

The support level is less than my institution's contributions.

Please comment on whether the support is or is not commensurate with your institution's contributions.

4. Research contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in research with the Lead ERC Institution.

5. Education contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in education with the Lead ERC Institution.

6. The Lead ERC Institution is responsive to my Institution's concerns and suggestions.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

7. There are administrative barriers (e.g. financial support flow, student exchange, curricular reciprocity, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

8. There are technical barriers (e.g. software compatibility, electronic interfaces, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

9. The cultural environment at the Lead ERC Institution contributes to a mutually beneficial relationship.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

10. There are leadership styles that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

11. There are discipline-related barriers that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

12. Has the relationship between your institution and the Lead ERC Institution changed over time? If so, please comment on the changes (e.g how and when the relationship changed; why the relationship changed.) Additionally, if the relationship has changed, is the level of support provided by the Lead ERC Institution still commensurate with your institution's contributions?

3. Outreach Partner: Relationship with Lead ERC Institution

The following questions invite you to consider the programmatic, administrative, technical and communicative relationship your institution has with the Lead ERC Institution.

1. Your institution's overall relationship with the Lead ERC Institution is mutually beneficial.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Please comment as desired.

2. Your overall expectation of the Lead ERC Institution.

The Lead ERC Institution meets our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution exceeds our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution does not meet our expectations.

Please comment as desired.

3. The level of support provided by The Lead ERC Institution.

The support level is commensurate with my institution's contributions.

The support level exceeds my institution's contributions.

The support level is less than my institution's contributions.

Please comment on whether the support is or is not commensurate with your institution's contributions.

4. Research contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in research with the Lead ERC Institution.

5. Education contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in education with the Lead ERC Institution.

6. The Lead ERC Institution is responsive to my Institution's concerns and suggestions.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

7. There are administrative barriers (e.g. financial support flow, student exchange, curricular reciprocity, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

8. There are technical barriers (e.g. software compatibility, electronic interfaces, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

9. The cultural environment at the Lead ERC Institution contributes to a mutually beneficial relationship.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

10. There are leadership styles that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

11. There are discipline-related barriers that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

12. Has the relationship between your institution and the Lead ERC Institution changed over time? If so, please comment on the changes (e.g how and when the relationship changed; why the relationship changed.) Additionally, if the relationship has changed, is the level of support provided by the Lead ERC Institution still commensurate with your institution's contributions?

4. Diversity Partner: Relationship with Lead ERC Institution

The following questions invite you to consider the programmatic, administrative, technical and communicative relationship your institution has with the Lead ERC Institution.

1. Your institution's overall relationship with the Lead ERC Institution is mutually beneficial.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Please comment as desired.

2. Your overall expectation of the Lead ERC Institution.

The Lead ERC Institution meets our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution exceeds our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution does not meet our expectations.

Please comment as desired.

3. The level of support provided by The Lead ERC Institution.

The support level is commensurate with my institution's contributions.

The support level exceeds my institution's contributions.

The support level is less than my institution's contributions.

Please comment on whether the support is or is not commensurate with your institution's contributions.

4. Research contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in research with the Lead ERC Institution.

5. Education contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in education with the Lead ERC Institution.

6. The Lead ERC Institution is responsive to my Institution's concerns and suggestions.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

7. There are administrative barriers (e.g. financial support flow, student exchange, curricular reciprocity, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

8. There are technical barriers (e.g. software compatibility, electronic interfaces, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

9. The cultural environment at the Lead ERC Institution contributes to a mutually beneficial relationship.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

10. There are leadership styles that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

11. There are discipline-related barriers that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

12. Has the relationship between your institution and the Lead ERC Institution changed over time? If so, please comment on the changes (e.g how and when the relationship changed; why the relationship changed.) Additionally, if the relationship has changed, is the level of support provided by the Lead ERC Institution still commensurate with your institution's contributions?

5. Other Partner: Relationship with Lead ERC Institution

The following questions invite you to consider the programmatic, administrative, technical and communicative relationship your institution has with the Lead ERC Institution.

1. Your institution's overall relationship with the Lead ERC Institution is mutually beneficial.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Please comment as desired.

2. Your overall expectation of the Lead ERC Institution.

The Lead ERC Institution meets our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution exceeds our expectations.

The Lead ERC Institution does not meet our expectations.

Please comment as desired.

3. The level of support provided by The Lead ERC Institution.

The support level is commensurate with my institution's contributions.

The support level exceeds my institution's contributions.

The support level is less than my institution's contributions.

Please comment on whether the support is or is not commensurate with your institution's contributions.

4. Research contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in research with the Lead ERC Institution.

5. Education contributions to the ERC.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Lead ERC enables my institution to contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please provide additional commentary on the level of engagement in education with the Lead ERC Institution.

6. The Lead ERC Institution is responsive to my Institution's concerns and suggestions.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

7. There are administrative barriers (e.g. financial support flow, student exchange, curricular reciprocity, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

8. There are technical barriers (e.g. software compatibility, electronic interfaces, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

9. The cultural environment at the Lead ERC Institution contributes to a mutually beneficial relationship.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

10. There are leadership styles that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

11. There are discipline-related barriers that prevent effective engagement with the Lead ERC Institution.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please comment as desired.

12. Has the relationship between your institution and the Lead ERC Institution changed over time? If so, please comment on the changes (e.g how and when the relationship changed; why the relationship changed.) Additionally, if the relationship has changed, is the level of support provided by the Lead ERC Institution still commensurate with your institution's contributions?

6. Lead ERC Institution: Relationship with Partners

The following statements invite you to consider the programmatic, administrative, technical and communicative relationship your institution has with your partners.

1. Your institution's overall relationship with the partners is mutually beneficial.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Agree

Please comment as desired.

2. Your overall expectations of the partners.

The partners meet our expectations.

The partners exceed our expectations.

The partners do not meet our expectations.

If the relationship is not equal across partners, please describe.

3. The level of contribution provided by the partners.

The contribution of the partners is commensurate with our institution's support level.

The contribution of the partners exceeds our institution's support level.

The contribution of the partners is less than our institution's support level.

Please elaborate if the contribution is not equal across partners.

4. The research contributions to the ERC:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The partners, relative to the level of support received, contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The partners enable my institution to contribute effectively to the research goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

Please elaborate if the contribution is not equal across partners.

5. The education contributions to the ERC:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
My institution contributes effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The partners, relative to the level of support received, contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ
The partners enable my institution to contribute effectively to the education goals of the ERC.	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ	jñ

Please elaborate if the contribution is not equal across partners.

6. The partners are responsive to our Institution's concerns and suggestions.

jñ Strongly Disagree

jñ Disagree

jñ Neutral

jñ Agree

jñ Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate if the responsiveness is not equal across the partners.

7. There are administrative barriers (e.g. financial support flow, student exchange, curricular reciprocity, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the partners.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate on any barriers with partners.

8. There are technical barriers (e.g. software compatability, electronic interfaces, and so forth) that prevent effective engagement with the partners.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate on any barriers with partners.

9. The cultural environment at the partner institutions contributes to a mutually beneficial relationship.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate as desired.

10. There are leadership styles that prevent effective engagement with the partners.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate as desired.

11. There are discipline-related barriers that prevent effective engagement with the partners.

Strongly Disagree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Strongly Disagree

Please elaborate if needed.

12. Has the relationship between your institution and (any of) the core partners changed over time? If so,

- How did the relationship change?
- When did the relationship change?
- Why did the relationship change?
- Is the level of support provided by your institution commensurate with the core partner's contributions?

7. Thank You!

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. Your responses will assist the NSF Engineering Research Center program in better understanding the effectiveness of the Center partnerships. The collective responses from this survey will be presented at the ERC Program Annual Meeting in December.