



Outline

- Introduction and Research Background
- The Design Science Research Paradigm
- Design Science Research Guidelines
- Case Study of Design Science Research

- Challenges
- Future Directions
- Science of Design Program at NSF
- Discussion



Research Portfolio

- Design Science as a Research Paradigm
- National Institute for Applied Computational Intelligence (NIACI)
 - Computational Intelligence (CI) Testing Tools
 - Graduate Courses on Software Testing and Information Systems Security
- Next Generation Software Engineering Program
 - SEI IRAD Funding for Program Comprehension via Function Extraction
 - Flow-Service-Quality Framework for NGSE
 - HICSS 2007 Minitrack
- Control in Flexible Software Development
- Software Development Project Estimation
 - Information Markets
 - Extend COCOMO II Models
- Technology Transfer PSP Case Study with SEI Cooperation
- Collaborative Programming and Agile Methods
- Telemedicine Quality Attributes VA Partner
- Inspection Techniques for Graphical Software Development Models



MISQ 2004 Research Essay

- A. Hevner, S. March, J. Park, and S. Ram, "Design Science Research in Information Systems," *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 1, March 2004, pp. 75-105.
- Historically, the IS field has been confused about the role of 'technical' research.
- Technical researchers felt out of the mainstream of ICIS/MISQ community.
 - Formation of Workshop on Information Technology and Systems (WITS) in 1991
 - Initial Discussions and Papers
 - Nunamaker et al. 1991 Electronic GDSS
 - Walls, Widmeyer, and El Sawy 1992 EIS Design Theory
 - March and Smith 1995 from WITS 1992 Keynote
 - Encouragement from IS Leaders such as Gordon Davis, Ron Weber, and Bob Zmud

- Allen Lee, EIC of MISQ, invited authors to submit essay on Design Science Research in 1998
 - Four Review Cycles with multiple reviewers
 - Published in 2004
 - Selected in October 2005 as ISI Fast Breaking Paper











Design Science Guidennes			
Guideline	Description		
Guideline 1: Design as an Artifact	Design-science research must produce a viable artifact in the form of a construct, a model, a method, or an instantiation.		
Guideline 2: Problem Relevance	The objective of design-science research is to develop technology-based solutions to important and relevant business problems.		
Guideline 3: Design Evaluation	The utility, quality, and efficacy of a design artifact must be rigorously demonstrated via well-executed evaluation methods.		
Guideline 4: Research Contributions	Effective design-science research must provide clear and verifiable contributions in the areas of the design artifact, design foundations, and/or design methodologies.		
Guideline 5: Research Rigor	Design-science research relies upon the application of rigorous methods in both the construction and evaluation of the design artifact.		
Guideline 6: Design as a Search Process	The search for an effective artifact requires utilizing available means to reach desired ends while satisfying laws in the problem environment.		
Guideline 7: Communication of Research	Design-science research must be presented effectively both to technology-oriented as well as management-oriented audiences.		







DC3I	gn Evaluation Methods	
1. Observational	Case Study – Study artifact in depth in business environment	
	Field Study – Monitor use of artifact in multiple projects	
2. Analytical	Static Analysis – Examine structure of artifact for static qualities (e.g., complexity)	
	Architecture Analysis – Study fit of artifact into technical IS architecture	
	Optimization – Demonstrate inherent optimal properties of artifact or provide optimality bounds on artifact behavior	
	Dynamic Analysis – Study artifact in use for dynamic qualities (e.g., performance)	
3. Experimental	Controlled Experiment – Study artifact in controlled environment for qualities (e.g., usability)	
	Simulation – Execute artifact with artificial data	
4. Testing	Functional (Black Box) Testing – Execute artifact interfaces to discover failures and identify defects	
	Structural (White Box) Testing – Perform coverage testing of some metric (e.g., execution paths) in the artifact implementation	
5. Descriptive	Informed Argument – Use information from the knowledge base (e.g., relevant research) to build a convincing argument for the artifact's utility	
	Scenarios – Construct detailed scenarios around the artifact to demonstrate its utility	



<section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>







Design Science Guidelines		
Guideline	Description	
Guideline 1: Design as an Artifact	Design-science research must produce a viable artifact in the form of a construct, a model, a method, or ar instantiation.	
Guideline 2: Problem Relevance	The objective of design-science research is to develop technology-based solutions to important and relevant business problems.	
Guideline 3: Design Evaluation	The utility, quality, and efficacy of a design artifact must be rigorously demonstrated via well-executed evaluation methods.	
Guideline 4: Research Contributions	Effective design-science research must provide clear and verifiable contributions in the areas of the design artifact, design foundations, and/or design methodologies.	
Guideline 5: Research Rigor	Design-science research relies upon the application of rigorous methods in both the construction and evaluation of the design artifact.	
Guideline 6: Design as a Search Process	The search for an effective artifact requires utilizing available means to reach desired ends while satisfying laws in the problem environment.	
Guideline 7: Communication of Research	Design-science research must be presented effectively both to technology-oriented as well as management-oriented audiences.	



Problem Relevance

• Problem Statement:

Public policy knowledge workers draw on a set of pre-existing tools when acquiring data from multiple data sources available from the information supply chain. The data acquisition process and the task of correctly combining and manipulating data from multiple data sources in the information supply chain have many challenges: data are unbounded, data definitions and schemas vary, and there is no guarantee of data quality. In most cases, knowledge workers make decisions with available information and use "gut instinct" or experience to choose the correct course of action when data sources conflict or do not match expectations. These challenges are made even more complicated by the knowledge worker's own judgment biases. Existing tools can aid knowledge workers, yet the lack of integration among these tools aggravate cognitive and behavioral biases and result in missed opportunities for knowledge creation. 25















Design Science Observations

- Design Science is Proactive with respect to technology (creating utility), Behavioral Science is Reactive (understanding truth)
 - We need both for an IS Research Cycle
- Align IS Design Science Research with real-world experience in Business and Industry
- Distinguish Design Science Research Artifacts from Routine System Building 33







National Science Foundation

- Basic scientific research & research fundamental to the engineering process;
- Programs to strengthen scientific and engineering research potential;
- Science and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields of science and engineering; and,
- A knowledge base for science and engineering appropriate for development of national and international policy











Computer and Network Systems Division (CNS)

- Computer Systems
 - Distributed systems; embedded and hybrid systems; nextgeneration software; parallel systems
- Network Systems
 - Networking research broadly defined plus focus areas
- Computing Research Infrastructure
 - Equipment and infrastructure to advance computing research
- Education and Workforce
 - IT workforce; special projects; cross-directorate activities (e.g., REU sites, IGERT, ADVANCE)
- Proposal Deadline: January 17, 2007



<section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item>

CISE Cross-Cutting Emphasis Areas

- Characteristics
 - cut across clusters and divisions (and directorates)
 - address scientific or national priority
- FY 2007 Emphasis Areas
 - GENI: December 15, 2006
 - CPLAN: January 23, 2007
 - Science of Design: February 5, 2007
 - Creativity in IT: Solicitation in February

Science of Design (SoD) Program at NSF

- Focus Design of Software-Intensive Systems
- Advance design research and education to meet critical software design challenges
- New paradigms, concepts, approaches, models, methods, and theories to build an intellectual foundation for software design to improve the processes of constructing, evaluating, and modifying software-intensive systems
- Research must be intellectually rigorous, formalized where appropriate, supported by empirical evidence, open to creative expression, and teachable.

46

SoD Program Objectives

- Fund original ideas on how to synthesize creative expression with scientific rigor in the design of relevant, useful software-intensive systems
- Import and adapt the most creative thinking about design from other scientific, engineering, and artistic fields while recognizing and addressing the unique nature of software
- Develop new, innovative constructs, models, methods, and tools to move software design into the next generation of complex, distributed computing environments.



SoD 2007 Solicitation

- New Solicitation Posted Oct. 12, 2006
- Proposal Deadline: Feb. 5, 2007
- Web URL: http://nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=12766&org=CISE&from=home

- Funding: \$10 Million
- Focus on Interdisciplinary Team Projects
- Individual PI Proposals are encouraged
- Educational Proposals
- Demonstration Testbeds for SoD Results

