

## AUTM & METRICS

Dr Kevin Cullen  
Brussels, Tuesday 9 September 2008



## AUTM Licensing survey

- was launched in 1993 (collecting data from 1990 onwards)
- has for many years been the gold standard
- current survey ('07 data) being crunched now

## AUTM Licensing survey

- Typically around 200 respondents
- covers >98% of US Govt Research Funding
- covers
  - Research expenditure
  - disclosures
  - patents
  - licences
  - start-ups

## Licensing survey

- Has been useful too!
  - demonstrating activity levels
  - benchmarking
  - basis for almost all academic study of TT
- Latest development is STATT

- \$45 billion R&D expenditures were received by US academic centers
- 697 new products introduced into the market in 2006 – 4,350 introduced from FY1998 through FY2006
- 553 new start-up companies launched in 2006
- 12,672 licenses and options were managed, yielding active income (each single license represents a one on-one relationship between a company and a university, hospital or research institution that earns income on products that benefit our communities)
- 5,724 new spin-outs from FY1980 through FY2006

## Executive Summit in 2003

- agreed licensing survey necessary, but not sufficient
- concerns over use of survey data
- agreed need to provide context
- BWR was born

## Better World Report

- annual publication
- 25 case studies
- 100 vignettes
- Very wide distribution of report
- appreciated locally
- Lacks quantitative aspect

## New Metrics

- Board level working group (Jones, Bostrom, Borman, Cullen) set up in July 2006
- Collaboration with Unico (UK) and ACCT (Canada)
- Objective to explore how much better to measure TT activity

## New Metrics

- Focussed on the metrics needed by;
  - a) Administrators or academic personnel to whom our members report
  - b) Governmental agencies and councils supporting research
  - c) Regional and national political groupings or representatives controlling funding to our institutions

## New Metrics

In each instance the information we wish to know, with regards to knowledge transfer activity of their organisation, includes:

- a) What information do these groups need, why do they perceive this need and on what schedule (annual, decade, etc) do they require it?
- b) What would they do with the information?
- c) What information do they use now, and how do they get it?
- d) What is the most critical piece of information they could have, that they lack now?
- e) What formats help them most – stories, hard numbers, comparisons, benchmarks, etc.?
- f) What other information/training/other needs do they perceive AUTM could help in providing?
- g) How does technology transfer information relate to other measures associated with the institutions our professionals serve?

## New Metrics - Activities

- Surveyed members on their needs
- Focus Group meetings with Government agencies, and funders and senior research officers
- Senior research officers

## New Metrics - Outcomes

### Modifying The Licensing Survey

- Technology types included
- Disclosure portfolio examined
- More information on start-ups gathered

### Still looking at

- Royalty Sales issue
- Co-ordination with BWR
  - ..... Improvement of the instrument

## Creating New Surveys

### Objectives, Structure & Scope Survey

- To identify 'shape' of TT at the institutional level
- Done in partnership with Maryann Feldman (UNC)
- In field now

## Objectives, Structure & Scope Survey

- Assess reporting lines
- Assess TT policies
- Assess authority levels
- Assess staffing levels
- Assess centralised vs decentralised resource
- Assess emphasis of licensing spin-out/ Ec Dev

## Objectives, Structure & Scope Survey

Will give AUTM data on the 'shape' of Tech transfer at the Institutional level

- Show where responsibility lies
- Show policy trends
- Show resource deployment patterns
- data due before Christmas

## Creating New Surveys

### The Transactions Survey

- To understand scope and volume of TT activities
- To understand relative priorities
- To understand how TTO time is used

## The Transactions Survey

### Agreements (Range of 8)

- Rank by priority
- Collect info on volume
- Collect info on time
- Collect info on responsibility
- Collect info on staff expertise

## The Transactions Survey

- Functions
  - Collect info on activities 'around' TT
    - marketing
    - student enterprise
    - Grants for TT/KT
    - teaching
    - Economic Development
    - etc

## Functions

- Collect info on
  - priority
  - volume
  - staff time spent
  - staff expertise
  - responsibility

## The Transactions Survey

### Funding

- Collect info on funding received as
    - Institutional budgets
    - TT support grants
    - Investment capital
    - Patent re-imbursments
- etc

## The Transactions Survey

Will give AUTM data on the 'shape' of Tech Transfer activity at the office level

- Show where time is spent
- Highlight operational priorities
- Show funding profile
- Identify the 'problem areas'

## Other Survey Work

- Salary Survey (in the field)
- MTA Survey
- International comparisons (Ashley)
- Scholar interactions (competition)
- Start-ups (with National Council of Entrepreneurial Tech Transfer ([NCET2.org](http://NCET2.org)))
- Establish Focus Groups

## Other Survey Work

And working with others

- Part of AAU Metrics Group
- Invited to participate in NSF metrics development
- Work closely with ASTP, ACCT, UNICO and others developing common standards and instruments

## In summary

- Annual Licensing Activity Survey still vital
  - will continue to evolve it
- Focus now on also gaining data on the ‘shape’ of it
  - responsibilities
  - roles
  - objectives
  - volumes
- This will help fill the gap between
  - revenue data in ALAR
  - case studies in BWR

## In summary

- AUTM keen to work with partners in doing this
- We hope there is scope to work with this group

Thank you

x.xxxxxx@xxxxxxxxxxx.xxx.xx.xx