

**Survey Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**February 24, 2012**  
**10:30 – 12:30 PM**  
**1911 Building rm 129**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Members present:** Nancy Whelchel, Mike Carter, Leslie Dare, Jason DeRousie, Ken Esbenshade, Ginny Hall, Sarah Lannom, Stan North Martin, Malina Monaco, Shevaun Neupert, Donna Petherbridge, Kevin Rice, Alan Schueler, Sheri Schwab, Carrie Zelna

**Not attending:** Maxine Atkinson, Michelle Johnson, Haylee McLean, John O'Daniel, Deb Paxton, Paul Umbach, Mike Williams

**Call to order:** Nancy Whelchel called the meeting to order at 10:35.

**Agenda**

**Approval of January 20, 2012 minutes:** Minutes were approved.

**Agenda:** Review objectives of the Survey Advisory Committee's charge and determine what survey activities should be included in the 'survey registration process' and calendar of survey activities.

The group outlined the following **objectives:**

- Develop an initial process to collect information on survey activities for one year.
- Provide visibility/awareness to the campus community about survey activity.
- Reduce over-surveying
- Identify and encourage opportunities for collaboration
- Avoid duplication/overlap in surveys (e.g., content, timing, population)
- Provide educational support/resources for survey research best practices
- Quality control

Potential **concerns** in carrying out such a process:

- Academic freedom
- Public records requests
- Burden on PI (e.g., more red tape, possible delays)
- Prioritization of survey activities (e.g., surveys related to SACS assessment requirements versus other surveys)
- Burden on UPA and/or SAC oversight committee

**Incentives** to encourage cooperation in registration process:

- Potential for improved response rates
- Potential for improved quality of surveys/data through educational outreach
- Increased awareness of and access to existing data/resources (e.g., samples, data/reports)
- Compliance with campus standards/expectations (e.g., leadership directive)
- Increased visibility of NC State activities (Note: could be disincentive...)

The group discussed possible criteria to determine what survey projects would be expected to participate in the 'registration' process. Broad topics to consider could include:

- Purpose of activity (e.g., research, assessment)
- PI status (e.g., external to university, NCSU administrator, faculty, staff, graduate student, undergraduate)
- Population (e.g., relative to PI, sample size, vulnerable)
- Respondent burden (e.g., estimated time to complete survey)
- Delivery mode (e.g., Brickyard, email)

- Need for assistance

The following specific inclusion and exclusion criteria for completing the registration form were suggested.

**Inclusion criteria:**

- Any survey activity meeting the inclusion criteria, including
  - Sponsored research / faculty research
  - Dissertation/thesis research
  - Large scale assessment activities
  - Student class projects
- Population consists of some number (to be determined) of
  - Currently enrolled NC State students; or
  - Currently employed NC State employees (administration, faculty, staff); or
  - NC State alumni; or
  - Admitted students (i.e., prior to arriving on campus)
- All external requests for surveys of NC State populations (as defined above), regardless of the size of the population
- All surveys focusing on 'vulnerable populations' at NC State (e.g., groups with relatively small numbers [e.g., Hispanic students, athletes])

**Exclusion criteria:**

- Student-led survey projects to meet course requirements, with only those also enrolled in the course in the population (regardless of the number of students)
- Student surveys of individuals in a particular group (e.g., student organization, club)
- Academic program evaluation (including any survey activities conducted by instructors of members of their course)
- Focus groups
- Point-of-contact surveys (e.g., post-activity follow-up,

There was continued discussion about the various nuances of inclusion and exclusion criteria. A subcommittee consisting of Leslie, Carrie, Malina, and Nancy agreed to meet and come up with a specific recommendation to present to the SAC at its next meeting.

It was suggested that it might be informative for SAC members to complete the registration form with survey activities for which they are responsible.

**Other issues raised:**

Sherri mentioned that the CALS extension faculty/staff administers various surveys, and that they might have a process in place to coordinate such activities.

Alan suggested that it would be helpful to have a single point of entry to help facilitate the process for the PIs (and UPA staff and SAC).

Ken mentioned how IRB should be involved in the process, such as by including information about the registration form in their materials.

**Next steps:**

- Subcommittee will meet to make recommendations for specific inclusion/exclusion criteria, and to review the registration form.
- Nancy will send out a Doodle Poll to schedule the next meeting

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00.