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**Proposal Narrative:**

Institutional researchers continue to face challenges in increasing response rates of undergraduate students to institution-wide surveys. These challenges include survey fatigue, survey length and IRB restrictions. This discussion group uses the Student Experience at the Research University (SERU) consortium study as a case study for addressing these challenges. The SERU survey gathers information about student engagement in activities that have been empirically shown to influence student learning and positive educational outcomes, both inside and outside of the classroom. The project provides data from a consortium of research universities that face similar and unique challenges in data administration. This presentation will begin with a background of the SERU study and a brief discussion of the content of the survey. We will then discuss the issues encountered by IR offices in maintaining and increasing response. These issues will include the use of incentives, marketing plan, mode of data collection, number of reminders for online surveys, IRB restrictions, testing phases, survey length, mobile compatibility of surveys and other issues as they arise in the group.

Questions to provide structure for the discussion:

1. What factors are important to consider prior to survey administration?
2. What are factors within your control?
3. How do resources and budgetary factors influence what you can and can’t do related to incentives and marketing plan?
4. How does your IRB impact your plans for survey administration?
5. How does enterprise-wide survey software impact response rates?

**Learning Outcomes:**

Participants in this session will learn about how many factors combine to influence response.

Participants in this session will learn about the importance of having a good marketing plan to aid in increasing response.

Participants in this session will share lessons learned regarding factors influencing response at their institution.

**Presenters Experience:**

Mark Miazga has coordinated SERU data administration since 2013 and previously created posters and presentations on factors related to response for the International Field Directors conference, Minnesota Institute of Public Health, American Public Health Association conference and the US Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention conference.

Jessica Schuett leads SERU content programming for the SERU consortium and is the lead data manager for the creation of all school files and yearly common data files related to SERU. Jessica works closely with the consortium schools on all issues related to the SERU survey including content, survey programming, administration, and reporting.

**Program Book Abstract:**

Increasing student response to surveys is an ongoing challenge. Consideration of many factors is needed before survey administration. These include survey fatigue, incentivization, marketing plan, data collection mode, number of reminders used in online surveys, IRB restrictions, testing phases, survey length and mobile compatibility. These should be addressed before administration to ensure adequate response for analysis, publishing, presenting and other institutional uses. The objectives of this session are to use the Student Experience at the Research University (SERU) study as a case study for discussing these factors and share lessons learned from other attendees related to increasing response rates.