

EPICENTER research summit

Post-Summit Survey Report

October 1st, 2014

Attendees' and UIFs' verbatim responses to open-ended questions available upon request; please contact ecostache@sagefoxgroup.com

Prepared by SageFox Consulting Group
Alan Peterfreund, Ph.D,
Emanuel Costache



Stanford
University



SAGEFOX CONSULTING GROUP

Epicenter Research – Post-Summit Survey Report

In collaboration with the Epicenter Research Team, SageFox co-developed and administered a survey for Epicenter Research Summit attendees. The survey was designed to help answer these guiding evaluation questions:

1. To what extent has the Research Summit met its stated goals?
 - a. Strengthen the entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education research community
 - b. Highlight and share the latest research findings from the community
 - c. Identify new questions in entrepreneurship education research
 - d. Create new connections and collaborations in this community
2. What aspects of the Summit were most and least successful?
3. What are the next steps in building and sustaining this community?

The survey was administered online one week after the Summit, from August 12th to 30th; invitees received a reminder on August 26th. The response rates are as follows:

Table 1: Response rates

	Invited	Responded	Response rate
Attendees: Researcher and Educators	23	19	83%
Attendees: Graduate Students	11	3	27%
University Innovation Fellows	9	9	100%

In the pages that follow, the responses from graduate students have been combined with those of the researchers and educators (as they were, on the whole, comparable) and are referred to as the “Attendees” while the UIFs’ responses are reported separately.

Highlights

Overall, the Summit was very well received and the high response rate from researchers and educators is an indication of the high level of enthusiasm, interest, and value the attendees had around dedicating time to focus on their (research) questions together and from a variety of perspectives.

Impressions of the Summit

The Summit was most effective in increasing awareness, including increased knowledge of the important research questions in engineering education and a greater sense of the value around that research and the community supporting that research. See Table 2, below:

Table 2: “To what extent has the summit...” (percent responding 4+5 on 1-5 Likert scale, where 1=not at all and 5=very much)

	Attendees n=22	UIF n=9
enhanced your knowledge of the important questions of the field?	86%	100%
affected your sense of the value of a research community around entrepreneurship and innovation in engineering education?	86%	67%
made you aware of what is important to researchers?	73%	89%
helped form new relationships/collaborations?	71%*	56%
made you aware of what is important to educators?	68%	56%
influenced your current or future research or practice?	55%	89%
affected your thinking about how to connect to researchers?	50%	89%
affected your thinking about how to connect to educators?	45%	56%
made you aware of what is important to entrepreneurs?	41%	67%
affected your thinking about how to connect to entrepreneurs?	41%	33%

*n=21

While more than half (55%) of non-UIF attendees responded that the Summit has influenced their current/future research or practice – which is a remarkable and concrete takeaway from a two-day event – 45-50% came away from the Summit with new thinking about how to connect with their colleagues. As entrepreneurs and their perspectives were not a primary focus of the agenda, fewer respondents felt they had connected with entrepreneurs.

Follow-up

As the Summit co-hosts and organizing team prepare the follow-up communications, promoting opportunities for the attendees (and the larger pool of invitees who were not able to attend) will be a key objective. Table 3, below, details the respondents’ preference regarding the potential forms this follow-up could take. While support for specific, in-person, and research- and activity-focused opportunities, including a future Summit, were especially well rated, attendees and UIFs both showed little support for a future webinar. Supporting presentations at ASEE 2015 (over Open and other conferences) and the publication of both informal ‘thought pieces’ and a major special-issue journal publication were also highly ranked. Importantly, there is an openness around informal sharing and wider dissemination, especially as an alternative to traditional publishing. There is also a high level of interest in collaboration, both on developing/refining research questions and creating new research proposals. These research- and activity-focused collaboration opportunities would seem to be the best avenues for follow-up.

Table 3: Please rate your level of interest in engaging in each of the following follow-up activities. (percent responding 4+5 on 1-5 Likert scale, where 1=not at all interested and 5=very interested)

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	n=9
Attending a future Epicenter Research Summit	77%	89%
Collaborating on new research proposals w/ other attendees	77%	89%
Presenting at 2015 ASEE (Seattle, June)	73%	78%
Discussing/refining research questions w/ other attendees	73%	78%
Creating thought-pieces (shorter publications)	71%*	78%
Working on a major publication (special issue, edited volume)	68%	78%
Presenting at the 2015 Open Conference (Wash. DC - March)	59%	78%
Other networking: technology facilitated, e.g., a LinkedIn group	55%	88%
Presenting at other conferences	45%	78%
Participating a webinar	38%*	44%

*n=21

Students – University Innovation Fellows

The role students can play, as sources of inspiration and unique perspectives, was recognized by many in their open-ended responses. In the words of one respondent: “I learned two entities are powerful in creating change: department heads and students. This was very insightful.” As Epicenter grows its student engagement efforts through the University Innovation Fellows program, there is an opportunity to continue to involve students as co-researchers.

Community and Epicenter’s Role

There is a strong endorsement of the value and importance of developing and nurturing a community of researchers and educators around engineering and entrepreneurship education (84% among non-UIF attendees) and an even stronger endorsement of Epicenter’s role as a leader in building this community (95% among attendees, 100% among UIFs) (Table 4).

Table 4: How important is it for Epicenter to be committing resources to building and sustaining the research community? (percent responding 4+5 on 1-5 Likert scale, where 1=not at all important and 5=very important)

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	N=9
Not at all important - 1	0	0
2	0	0
3	5%	0
4	18%	22%
Very important - 5	77%	78%

Faculty respondents noted that the key values of a research community focused on entrepreneurship and innovation in engineering education would be:

- To demonstrate value of entrepreneurship education
- To nurture and support the researchers in this community
- To empower and support students (as researchers/collaborators)

Asked specifically what Epicenter’s priorities should be in this area, respondents focused on three key points:

- Demonstrating and sharing the value of research with wider audiences
- Building a community of researchers focused on entrepreneurship and innovation in engineering education
- Supporting this community with effective communications, internally and public-facing

In the words of one respondent, Epicenter has an opportunity to “help steer research efforts toward practical results,” by continuing to engage the community (including students) that is sprouting up around the Epicenter Research Summit.

Responses In Detail – Attendees and UIFs

Attendees’ and UIFs’ verbatim responses to open-ended questions 7, 11–14, and 16 are available upon request

1. How would you identify yourself?

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	n=9
Researcher	3	0
Educator	4	0
Researchers + Educators	12	0
Grad Student	3	0
University Innovation Fellow	0	9

2. Please rate your level of interest in engaging in each of the following follow-up activities.

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	n=9
Attending a future Epicenter Research Summit	77%	89%
Collaborating on new research proposals w/ other attendees	77%	89%
Presenting at 2015 ASEE (Seattle - June)	73%	78%
Discussing/refining research questions w/ other attendees	73%	78%
Creating thought-pieces (shorter publications)	71%*	78%
Working on a major publication (special issue, edited volume)	68%	78%
Presenting at the 2015 Open Conference (Wash. DC - March)	59%	78%
Other networking: technology facilitated, e.g., a LinkedIn group	55%	88%
Presenting at other conferences	45%	78%
Participating a webinar	38%*	44%

*n=21

3. To what extent has the summit...

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	n=9
enhanced your knowledge of the important questions of the field?	86%	100%
affected your sense of the value of a research community around entrepreneurship and innovation in engineering education?	86%	67%
made you aware of what is important to researchers?	73%	89%
helped form new relationships/collaborations?	71%*	56%
made you aware of what is important to educators?	68%	56%
influenced your current or future research or practice?	55%	89%
affected your thinking about how to connect to researchers?	50%	89%
affected your thinking about how to connect to educators?	45%	56%
made you aware of what is important to entrepreneurs?	41%	67%
affected your thinking about how to connect to entrepreneurs?	41%	33%
		*n=21

4. Please rate the value of networking at the summit with each of the following groups.

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	n=9
Educators	90%*	78%
Entrepreneurs	40%†	67%
Researchers	82%	100%
Students	67%*	100%
	*n=21	†n=20

5. How valuable was the feedback you received on your poster, based on your interests and/or research?

	Attendees	UIF
	n=15	n=9
Not at all valuable - 1	7%	0
2	20%	38%
3	27%	13%
4	20%	13%
Very valuable - 5	27%	38%

6. How valuable was feedback you received on your presentation (from attendees), if you presented?

	Attendees	UIF
	n=7	N=9
Not at all valuable - 1	0	0
2	0	14%
3	29%	43%
4	43%	14%
Very valuable - 5	29%	29%

8. Would you have preferred... Less/same/more structure

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	N=9
Less structure	22%	67%
Same amount of structure	78%	33%
More structure	0	0

9. Would you have preferred... Fewer/same/greater # presentations

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	N=9
Fewer presentations	23%	32%
About the same	73%	64%
Greater number of presentations	5%	5%

10. Please rate your satisfaction with each of the following.

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	N=9
Level of engagement in helping to form the Summit's agenda	71%*	78%
Material made available prior to the Summit	81%*	75%
Convenience of the location (Stanford, Palo Alto)	82%	89%
Time of year (early August)	82%	89%

*n=21

15. How important is it for Epicenter to be committing resources to building and sustaining the research community?

	Attendees	UIF
	n=22	N=9
Not at all important - 1	0	0
2	0	0
3	5%	0
4	18%	22%
Very important - 5	77%	78%