

Survey Advisory Committee Meeting
October 21, 2013
9:00 – 10:30 AM
DH Hill Library, Faculty Senate Chambers
Meeting Minutes

Members present: Nancy Whelchel, Mike Cobb, Leslie Dare, Jason DeRousie, Sarah Lannom, Stan North Martin, Brian O'Sullivan, Bill Oxenham, Deb Paxton, Donna Petherbridge, Matt Stimpson, Holly Swart

Not attending: Michael Carter, Doug Gillan, Malina Monaco, Marguerite Moore, Tracey Ray, Kevin Rice, Sheri Schwab, Paul Umbach

Guest: Traci Temple

Call to order: Nancy Whelchel called the meeting to order at 9:05.

Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves to Traci Temple, the new Assistant Director for Planning and Assessment in DELTA.

Approval of September 16, 2013 minutes

Minutes were approved with no revisions.

Discussion of Draft Regulation

Nancy explained that Karen Helm and Betsy Brown advised moving forward as quickly as possible on the drafting and vetting of the Regulation. She said that she had met with Betsy and Sarah Lannom to discuss the formatting of the Regulation and the general content that should be included in it and in a Standing Operating Procedures document to accompany it, and then drafted the document. The draft shared with the SAC for today had gone through several revisions based on feedback from Karen, Betsy, Sarah, and Clifton Williams in General Counsel.

Purpose of the Regulation

Throughout the meeting the discussion often came back to the purpose of the Regulation. i.e., that for NC State projects there be no evaluation/approval, but rather that we are trying to collect the best information we can on the extent of survey activities on campus. We discussed the need to be more specific in the Regulation about the educational value of the process, including letting those planning on administering a survey know about other survey activities on campus, including the possibility of getting information from other surveys, and coordinating the timing of survey activities.

Using the Number in the Population/Sample as a Criteria:

Members revisited the discussion about the appropriateness of using the number of people in the survey population/sample as the criteria for having the project leader be required to complete the Survey Registration Form. Initially the question was raised in relation to the appropriateness of using the 100 person threshold for faculty as well as for students, given that the overall number of faculty is only a fraction of that of students. That led to further discussion about having the requirement to complete the form being based on the purpose and/or content of the survey project, rather than simply on the number in the population/sample. The group generally agreed that that would be a preferable approach, but that it would be difficult to operationalize, would perhaps create confusion and generate lots of questions from project directors, and challenging and time-consuming for SAC to review. In the end the group agreed to drop the number criteria altogether, and to expand on the specific exclusion/inclusion criteria based on the type of survey activity.

Exclusion/Inclusion Criteria:

Some examples of specific types of activities to mention as being excluded from the regulation were discussed. These include “intercept surveys” (i.e., stopping people on the Brickyard to ask them questions), face-to-face interviews with specific groups of students (e.g., graduating senior exit interview conducted by the department), surveys of those who are on campus for a specific event but who are not really affiliated with the NCSU (e.g., summer counselors for academic summer camps), surveys of business partners on Centennial Campus, and forms that individuals are asked to complete as part of doing business at NC State (e.g., updating contact information in the directory).

Burden on Project Leaders and SAC

The group discussed the pros and cons of requiring that a Survey Registration Form be completed for all projects meeting the inclusion criteria, even those with relatively few people. The general thinking is that it would probably be better to start as broadly as possible then narrow the focus as appropriate after evaluating the initial process. Broadening the scope will be more work for SAC and for project investigators, but the thinking is that those administering a survey meeting the criteria should be able to provide the information requested in the form.

IRB / SAC Coordination

Nancy and Deb discussed the challenges of having IRB identity surveys projects that might meet the criteria for completing the Survey Registration Form. Deb explained that Principal Investigators don't always specifically identify their survey population/sample as being members of the NC State campus community, and/or that those numbers can easily vary during the course of a specific project.

Regulation Revisions

The groups discussed specific revisions to some of the language and formatting of the Regulation. These will be noted in the draft Regulation save in the SAC Google Drive, but, to summarize:

- Change “Principal Investigator” to “Project Leader”
- Add a specific role for the “NC State Liaison,” the person in direct contact with the external requestor.
- Change “NC State Representative” to “NC State Key Personnel” (or something like that...). We also need to try to generally identify these people (e.g., ES1 or ES2)

Sub-Committees

Nancy discussed the need for sub-committees to be formed and for those committees to start taking on some of the responsibilities for SAC-related tasks. The proposed committees are:

- SAC website
- Communications/PR
- External Review
- Education / Best Practices
- Metrics

Next Steps

- Nancy will put the Regulation and Standard Operating Procedures documents on our Google Drive for members to comment on.
- Nancy will put a sub-committee sign-up sheet on our Google Drive for members to indicate their sub-committee preference(s)
- Nancy will revise the Regulation and SOP based on SAC feedback, and present it to the group for discussion at the November meeting.
- Nancy will contact appropriate committees on campus to get on their calendar to present the draft regulation

Next Meeting

- Monday, November 18, 9:00-10:30, DH Hill Library, Faculty Senate Chambers (Rm 2320)

Homework...

- Carefully review the draft Regulation and SOP documents in the 'regulation' folder in our Google Drive directory and add your comments.
- Sign up for a sub-committee(s) in the form in the 'admin' folder in our Google Drive directory.