



Membership Satisfaction Survey Report

A Summary of the Findings

Paul D. Smith

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Conclusions	3
Introduction	4
Do members believe CACEE is achieving its Mission?	5
Do members value what CACEE offers, and are we delivering?.....	6
Cumulative Results.....	7
Networking / Relationship Building Opportunities.....	7
2006 vs. 2012	8
Conclusion.....	8
Professional Development Opportunities	8
2006 vs. 2012	9
Conclusions	9
Research / Knowledge Sharing / Best Practices.....	9
2006 vs. 2012	10
Conclusions	10
Communications	10
Conclusions	11
Priorities.....	11
Conclusions	13
Final Thoughts.....	13
Appendix A	14
Appendix B	28

Executive Summary

The Report that follows is a summary of the findings from the 2012 Membership Satisfaction Survey conducted by the Canadian Association of Career Educators and Employers (CACEE). The Survey was conducted on-line between the dates of February 15 and March 31. It was available in French (5 respondents) and English (71 respondents). This Report combines the responses from both groups and presents aggregate data because the French sample was too small to offer reliable measurement. The ratio of educator to employer (4:1) is a possible confounding factor when considering the validity of the findings, skewing the data toward the educator perspective. The Report also includes references to a similar survey conducted in 2006. A comparison of the data from 2006 and 2012 shows remarkable consistency, with notable exceptions (Research & Information). This consistency offers reassurance that the data is revealing an accurate representation of the opinions of our members.

The abiding theme of this Report could be summarized with the following statement: “Do more, and do it better.” The tone of the findings of this Report is largely positive, with notable areas that warrant attention. Members value the work that CACEE currently does, and they would like us to expand into related fields, particularly research and professional development. Where members feel that CACEE is falling short they have provided constructive criticism to guide the Board going forward. Members also want the Association to expand its efforts geographically, particularly in Canada West. Multiple requests were expressed for PD and networking events outside of Ontario.

A number of recommendations have emerged from the analysis. The recommendations have emerged from the analysis of the data. They are not intended to be considered the final word, but to focus the discussion around the items of interest that emerged.

Conclusions

1. CACEE should make an effort to offer events in every Region each year.
2. CACEE should review its current PD initiatives. The review should include more in-depth analysis of members’ needs and desires for Professional Development. This could be accomplished through a follow-up survey, focus group, interviews, or other measurement. Before undertaking this effort, however, it may still be safely assumed that CACEE should offer more webinars, roundtables, and PD events. Moreover, they should feature new presenters with new messages.
3. CACEE should review its current website in a manner similar to the PD review, perhaps in conjunction. Members clearly value the website, but feel this important CACEE element delivered less satisfactorily than most others. This is disappointing as the website was re-launched less than two years ago.
4. CACEE should continue with the benchmark survey.
5. CACEE should investigate ways that it could support research into best practices in the offering of career support in a higher-education environment.
6. CACEE should be a research and knowledge clearing house and archive.
7. CACEE Should review CACEE Connect with the goal of identifying steps to make it more interesting and effective.
8. CACEE should review our efforts in the social media sphere, and to make a strategic decision about the appropriate level of commitment in this area.
9. CACEE should conduct similar surveys on a regular basis; every three years would be advised.
10. CACEE should consider how it might provide research related to best practices within campus career centres.

Introduction

In the winter of 2012 the National Board of the Canadian Association of Career Educators (CACEE) undertook to survey the members of the Association. The goal of the survey was to measure member satisfaction with CACEE's activities and to identify members' priorities over the next few years. Measuring member satisfaction with the organization is a key to effective strategic management, and the CACEE National Board is committed to offering members quality services that they value. The findings of the survey will inform Board decisions in the near to midterm.

The Report that follows is a summary of the findings from the 2012 Membership Satisfaction Survey conducted by CACEE. The Survey was conducted on-line between the dates of February 15 and March 31. It was available in French (5 respondents) and English (71 respondents). This Report combines the responses from both groups and presents aggregate data because the French sample was too small to offer reliable measurement. Respondents represented twenty five different organizations, six employers, nineteen educators. The average duration of CACEE membership was just over six years, with eight months as the minimum and twenty years at the maximum.

The ratio of employer to educator is a possible confounding factor when considering the validity of the findings, skewing the data toward the educator perspective. The ratio of 4 educators: 1 employer does not quite represent CACEE's overall membership, which fluctuates between a ratio of 2:1 and 3:1, so this should be noted. It may be prudent to address this question when designing similar surveys in the future. The overall sample size, however, is large enough to consider the survey findings to be reliable.

Reliability and Consistency

The Report also includes references to a similar survey conducted in 2006. The sample size of that survey was quite a bit larger, with 133 respondents, and the ratio was 4:1, virtually equal to the 2012 survey. The sample size for this survey was, of course, also sufficient for the findings to be considered reliable. A comparison of the data from 2006 and 2012 shows remarkable consistency, with notable exceptions (Research & Information). This consistency offers reassurance that the data is revealing an accurate representation of the opinions of our members.

Surveys and Strategic Management

These Reports have provided CACEE with a benchmark against which it may now measure future activities. It has also demonstrated to the membership that the Board is open to their input, as evidenced by one member's explicit expression of gratitude for undertaking the survey (See Appendix). The literature around association governance calls for regular membership surveys as a key element of strategic management. For these reasons I recommend continuing with this survey on a regular, and more frequent, basis. Every three years the membership should be asked to participate in a satisfaction survey that will continue to ask similar questions. The frequency should be sufficient to provide timely input, without causing survey fatigue, and the similar structure should allow for valuable comparisons allowing the Board to track changes.

Do members believe CACEE is achieving its Mission?

The survey began with a broad question intended to gauge opinions on the overall efforts of the Association. Members were asked if they believe CACEE is achieving its mission, and 76.3% of members believe that it is. This is quite a solid number, a B+ at most institutions. When combined with the total number of those who are neutral on the question (25.3%), it is apparent that nobody believed that CACEE is failing to achieve its mission (Table 1).

When members were asked the same question in 2006 (Table 2), 77.6% Strongly Agreed or Agreed that CACEE was meeting its Mission. That is virtually the same level as 2012, a remarkable consistency over a six year span. Where a difference can be found it is in the lower scores on the table. In 2006, 6.57% of members disagreed with the notion that CACEE was achieving its Mission, while 18.2% were neutral on the question. The combined score comes in at 24.77%, a near match to the 2012 score of 25.3%.

Table 1 - Is CACEE Achieving its Mission 2012?

1. The Canadian Association of Career Educators and Employers (CACEE) is a national non-profit partnership of employer recruiters and career services professionals. Our mission is to provide authoritative information, advice, professional development opportunities and other services to employers, career services professionals, and students." Do you believe that CACEE is achieving its mission?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	10.1%	10
Agree	66.2%	47
Neutral	25.3%	18
Disagree	0.00%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0

n = 71

Table 2 Is CACEE Achieving its Mission 2006?

1. Is CACEE Achieving its Mission?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	9%	22
Agree	68.6%	94
Neutral	18.2%	25
Disagree	6.57%	9
Strongly Disagree	0.00%	0

n = 137

If a trend can be established based on two data points, then CACEE is trending to positive on this measurement. The top end of the scoreboard was consistent over the two reports, but our bottom end showed improvement. A portion of the sample that had been negative has instead become neutral, a positive development it would appear. The Board is left to decide whether it is satisfied with this. No doubt, 76%, or a B+, is good, but 80% or an A would be better.

The Board may focus on supporting the trend and improving the rating. There are good reasons to do so - satisfaction diminishes incentive and innovation. A satisfied board may stop trying to improve, and it is said that life is lived on an incline, one may go up, or one will go down – there is no standing still. The change between 2006 and 2012 was manifest in what had been negative becoming neutral, which is progress. The challenge now is to move the neutral to the positive. The current neutral level is nearly double the number of people who strongly believe that CACEE is achieving its mission. That leaves room for continued improvement. If just four Neutral respondents

and four Agree respondents could be encouraged to move their rating up just one step, the Agree / Strongly Agree population would move past 80%. What remains is to determine how to improve these numbers. The information that follows may well provide direction on what the members need to see to encourage them to change our mission related grade to an A.

Do members value what CACEE offers, and are we delivering?

In Question 2, the survey asked members to begin focusing on detail related to the individual services and activities offered by the Association. Members were presented with a list of nineteen activities / services offered by CACEE, grouped into 4 sets:

- Networking / Relationship Building Opportunities,
- Professional Development Opportunities,
- Research / Knowledge Sharing / Best Practices, and
- Communications.

Members were asked to grade the items on two criteria - quality / effectiveness (**QE**), and importance or value (**IV**). The QE score will tell us how we are doing in the delivery of our various efforts, and the IV score will tell us if they value the item being delivered. To put it another way, the QE tells us if we are doing the thing right, the IV tells us if we are doing the right thing.

Members were asked to grade on a simple scale where 1 = Very Low and 5 = Very High. The nineteen elements will be compared within their set to determine which we do better than others, and which are more highly valued. A comparison across the entire list will also be done.

Four questions were taken into particular consideration in analyzing the data. They are:

- What do we do well? (the relative QE score of each item compared to those in its group, and in the overall ranking)
- What do members value, or hold to be important? (the relative IV score of each item compared to those in its group, and in the overall ranking)
- Are there items that members value that we could / should do better? (Looking for gaps between QE and IV scores).
 - Measuring the gap between QE and IV provides a relevant, and relative, data set. We may want to be careful with general assumptions about the meaning of the gap, but noting the difference between wider and narrower gaps will still tell us something.
- Is the item valued by a large number of members? (The number of respondents who provided a ranking, represented by *n*).
 - Where an item has been assessed by a small number of respondents it is likely because others felt the item does not apply to them (for example, regional events). This should be noted.

In the 2006 Survey, members were asked their opinions on eight activities / services, considerably fewer than the nineteen items for 2012. This limits comparison year over year, but where possible it will be done. The reasons for the difference are in some cases because of method – in 2006 the elements were not grouped, so there were no Overall scores available for the groupings. Also, social media was not a factor, Career Options did not have a website, CACEE Connect had yet to launch and the 101 Program was not on radar.

Cumulative Results

Before starting in on the individual element analyses let's have a look at the cumulative numbers. This will place the rankings for each item in some context relative to the entire list.

Table 3 - Cumulative Data - 2012

	Highest	Lowest	Average
QE Score	3.92 National Conference Networking Sessions	2.89 Marketplace	3.40
IV Score	4.33 National Conference Networking Sessions	3.00 Marketplace	3.74
Gap between IV and QE	.59 Website	.03 Awards Program	0.47

Table 4 - Cumulative Data - 2006

	Highest	Lowest	Average
QE Score	4.02 Conferences	2.19 Research & Information	3.31
IV Score	4.36 Networking	1.87 Research & Information	3.75
Gap between IV and QE	.94 Web Resources	-.15 Career Options	.44

Note the consistency. The average IV scores for 2006 and 2012 are virtually identical, and the average gap between QE and IV is also quite similar. There is a slightly larger divergence when it comes to the QE scores, but they are still quite comparable at a difference of .09. In both Reports the members appear to more highly value the services and activities CACEE offers than our demonstrated ability to deliver them (with one notable exception from 2006 – Research & Information). This is interesting, and begs comment.

It would appear that CACEE is consistently underperforming in response to members' needs, but caution should be exercised before making that conclusion. There could be a confounding factor at work. The IV score represents an ideal or an expectation, while the QE score is based on lived experience, and few things ever live up to their expectations. Perhaps the prudent course of action will be to accept the gap, and be concerned not that it exists, but rather with the relative size of each instance.

Networking / Relationship Building Opportunities

Within the networking category, our members indicate that we do a relatively good job of offering networking sessions at our national conference, and they value the sessions. The gap between the two is a reasonable .41; lower than the average gap of .47. On the opposite end, a QE score of 2.89 says we don't do a particularly good job of offering a market at our national conferences, i.e. offering vendors access to our members in attendance. But with a corresponding IV score of 3.00 our members have told us they don't particularly value the service, so no harm. Interestingly, the marketplace is well-developed by some of our international counterparts who use the sale of access to the market to generate revenue for their associations. Clearly, their vendors must perceive a value here that our general membership would not.

Members' comments related to networking were few, but they indicated a demand for more:

- *Are there any networking events happening outside of Ontario?*
- *CACEE conference was a fabulous networking opportunity and I would like to see more events throughout the year or virtual ways for career centres to connect directly with recruiters.*

Table 5 Networking / Relationship Building Opportunities

2012 Data				
2. For the following CACEE services/activities, please evaluate: 1) the current quality/effectiveness; 2) how important or valuable the service is to you (regardless of the level of current quality/effectiveness).				
Service / Activity	QE	n	IV	n
a. <i>National Conference Networking Sessions</i>	3.92	64	4.33	67
b. <i>Ontario Regional Conference Networking Sessions</i>	3.55	40	3.88	42
c. <i>Stand Alone Networking Events (i.e. Employer/Educator Roundtable, PD Events)</i>	3.25	61	3.74	66
d. <i>Marketplace (access to vendors and member discounts)</i>	2.89	63	3.00	65
e. <i>Overall</i>	3.51	71	3.83	64
Cumulative - 2012	3.42		3.76	
2006 Data				
<i>Networking</i>	3.67	132	4.36	129
<i>Conferences</i>	4.02	133	4.28	134
<i>Marketplace</i>	2.86	126	3.21	107

2006 vs. 2012

Three elements offer comparable data points between 2006 and 2012 – *Networking Conferences and Marketplace*. Marketplace is comparable year over year, demonstrating consistently low QE and IV scores. Conferences and Networking are more complex because there is incomplete alignment in the data. The following may be said, however, without fear of contradiction – Networking and Conferences are consistently valued, and delivered with some effectiveness.

Conclusions

Members want more networking opportunities, and they want them to happen outside of Southern Ontario. Efforts should be made to offer events in each of the Regions.

Professional Development Opportunities

Within the professional development category, our members report that we do webinars relatively well (3.50), but our website could use some attention. It should also be noted that, excepting webinars, the items all grouped between 3.3 and 3.37 on QE, which is lower than the combined QE average of 3.4. Meanwhile, PD had the highest average IV score, coming in at 3.84. This data is telling us we need to pay attention - our members have told us that PD is what they value most, but we deliver it least effectively, as evidenced by the lowest cumulative QE score – 3.37. The website merits particular notice

Anecdotal data tells a similar story – members want more, and they want us to do it better:

- *I would like to see PD events/conference information (ie. program content & registration) earlier.*
- *I plan my schedule months in advance - last minute webinars and events are not on my radar.*

- *There are not enough round table discussions.*
- *In person PD events are not in our budget.*
- *Some variety in topics at conferences would be good. Sometimes we tend to see same people with the same message.*
- *I have participated in the first three Career Educator modules and I was disappointed as some of the information was repetitive and not new to me.*
- *I would like to see advanced professional development opportunities for members.*

Table 6 Professional Development Opportunities

2012 Data				
Service / Activity	QE	n	IV	n
<i>f. Career Educator 101 / Recruiter 101 Programs</i>	3.35	34	3.89	44
<i>g. Webinars</i>	3.50	58	3.82	65
<i>h. PD Events (1 day or 1/2 day events, Roundtables, etc.)</i>	3.30	56	3.76	63
<i>i. Website (online directories, career fair calendar, etc.)</i>	3.31	65	3.90	68
<i>j. Overall</i>	3.37	71	3.86	72
Cumulative	3.37		3.84	
2006 Data				
<i>Professional Development</i>	3.32	118	4.25	136
<i>Web Resources</i>	3.29	133	4.24	136

2006 vs. 2012

The data shows consistency – PD was even more highly valued in 2006, but members awarded CACEE a mediocre QE score, just .05 lower than the 2012 cumulative score. The website, compared here to 2006’s Web Resources, fares little better. Members have been underwhelmed for a while here.

Conclusions

CACEE should review its current PD initiatives. The review should include more in-depth analysis of members’ needs and desires for Professional Development. This could be accomplished through a follow-up survey, focus group, interviews, or other measurement. Before undertaking this effort, however, it may still be safely assumed that CACEE should offer more webinars, roundtables, and PD events. Moreover, they should feature new presenters with new messages.

CACEE should review its current website in a manner similar to the PD review, perhaps in conjunction. Members clearly value the website, but feel this important CACEE element delivered less satisfactorily than most others. This is disappointing as the website was re-launched less than two years ago.

Research / Knowledge Sharing / Best Practices

It seems that members value all of our efforts in this category, and they feel we deliver them relatively well. The Benchmark Survey appears to be well-thought-of, both in concept and execution, and the double-barrelled delivery of *Career Options* meets with satisfaction. The scores for the Awards program fall-off a bit compared to the others, but the QE and IV numbers nearly match, telling us that it is delivered at a level equal to their valuation of it – the closest pairing in the data.

Anecdotal data provides additional detail about the members’ needs:

- *Benchmarking survey is good, but I am more interested in research related to practices/theories in career development and support. In other words, we need more support in being better educators.*
- *I have not seen the results of the benchmark survey and would be interested in other events where career centres can learn about/share resources with other schools (eg: a virtual shared drive where you can put presentations, handouts, activities)*
- *a virtual webinar/roundtable where people can join in once or twice a year and talk about important issues related to career services/recruitment.*

Table 7 Research / Knowledge Sharing / Best Practices

2012 Data				
Service / Activity	QE	n	IV	n
k. <i>Research/information services (CACEE Campus Recruitment and Benchmark Survey)</i>	3.81	70	4.19	70
l. <i>Career Options Magazine</i>	3.60	70	3.70	70
m. www.careeroptionsmagazine.com	3.57	51	3.77	57
n. <i>Awards Program (Regional Awards, Outstanding Contribution, Moe Ktytor Award of Merit, etc.)</i>	3.42	60	3.45	64
o. <i>Overall</i>	3.46	63	3.74	65
Cumulative	3.57		3.77	
<i>Research & Information</i>	2.19	112	1.87	133
<i>Career Options Magazine</i>	3.58	126	3.73	132
<i>Subject Matter Expertise</i>	3.43	128	4.23	135

2006 vs. 2012

The most striking element that emerges when we compare the 2006 and 2012 data in this category is the remarkable increase in the QE and IV scores for Research & Information. The intervention that could be credited with this impact is the Benchmark Survey – the first efforts in this regard didn’t begin until 2007.

Conclusions

CACEE should continue with the benchmark survey.

CACEE should investigate ways that it could support research into best practices in the offering of career support in a higher-education environment.

CACEE should be a research and knowledge clearing house and archive.

Communications

IF our members want more and better PD, they also want us to do a better job of communicating about it. Actually, they would like us to do a better job of communicating generally. CACEE Connect was the only communication tool to achieve a QE score above the average of 3.4, while e-mail blasts came in pretty much on average at 3.37. Our social media efforts came in at a sub-par 3.22.

The relatively positive score for CACEE Connect should be considered in light of anecdotal evidence that reveals a portion of our membership would like us to reformat CACEE Connect to make it more interesting. These are valid observations, and worth consideration, but it is likely true that most corporate newsletters have relatively few fans.

Similarly targeted for special commentary was our effort, or perceived lack thereof, in the social media sphere. This is a little confounding, though, because the IV score for social media came in lower than the others in the category, and among the lowest overall. This is counter-intuitive, and contrary to perceived trends. Communication is migrating toward more involvement with social media; our own data from the Benchmark Survey tells us that social recruiting is exploding. Our empirical data tells us that our members don't feel that social media efforts are relatively valuable or important, but that is confounding when compared with our anecdotal evidence. Members may not have scored social media efforts as important on the score, but those who want CACEE to do more took the time to comment.

Members Comments:

- *The current format of the newsletter is not as effective as it could be - things don't grab my attention - even when they are important.*
- *The CACEE e-newsletter is too small to read and boring to look at.*
- *CACEE is ineffective in their social media usage.*
- *CACEE doesn't have much of a social media identity currently... I think there needs to be a game plan that fits with the current & target demographic.*
- *Newsletter format is not inviting to read. Have to scroll too much.*
- *Too many email blasts and again, not very attractive or consistent in quality*

Table 8 Communications

2012 Data				
Service / Activity	QE	n	IV	n
<i>p. CACEE Connect (e-newsletter)</i>	3.53	72	3.70	71
<i>q. E-mail blasts (Targeted messages to members)</i>	3.37	63	3.64	69
<i>r. Social Media Initiatives (Twitter, LinkedIn Groups, Facebook)</i>	3.22	59	3.42	65
<i>s. Overall</i>	3.5	66	3.60	70
Cumulative	3.41		3.60	
2006 Data - Nil				

Conclusions

CACEE should review CACEE Connect with the goal of identifying steps to make it more interesting and effective.

CACEE should review our efforts in the social media sphere, and to make a strategic decision about the appropriate level of commitment in this area.

Priorities

This question, in some ways, might be seen as a quicker way to ask Question 2. It is certainly a companion question. Where Question 2 probed on the topic of what we do and how we do it, in the present, Question 3 asks members to look ahead. If our data is reliable, we should see continuity between aspirations for the present and the future. The IV scores from Question 2 should predict the rank of priorities in Question 3. A matching exercise reveals that we have significant congruence.

- 1 – b
- 2 – c, d
- 3 – ?
- 4 – a, d

Table 9 Comparing Priorities to IV Scores

Top Four IV scores from Question 2	Top Four Priorities
1. National Conference Networking Sessions	a. Professional development events
2. Research/information services (CACEE Campus Recruitment and Benchmark Survey)	b. Networking/relationship building activities
3. Website (online directories, career fair calendar, etc.)	c. Research/information services
4. Career Educator 101 / Recruiter 101 Programs	d. Subject matter expertise

As indicated earlier, it gives a researcher comfort when data sets that should match hypothetically turn out to actually match. True, we did not have complete congruence, because we don't have a Priority match for the IV item Websites (3.9). Full congruence, however, is possible if we exchange Websites with *Ontario Conference Networking Sessions* (3.88), which is statistically tied with Website.

Examining the bottom end of the Priority list reveals continued congruence with the lower end of the IV scores from Question 2. Nobody wants the Board to focus on the Marketplace in the future, and they are not particularly interested in the offering in the present. That aligns neatly with the item second from the bottom – revenue generating activities. The alignment comes from the reality that the main reason we offer the Marketplace at conferences is to generate revenue. This is not particularly surprising, of course, because the members suspect that revenue will probably come from them, and they are not that keen to have CACEE reach into their pocket.

Table 10 Priorities

3. In what areas would you like to see CACEE place priority over the next three years? (Select no more than four)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
professional development events	77.1%	54
networking/relationship building activities	64.3%	45
research/information services	52.9%	37
subject matter expertise	50%	35
conferences	40%	28
web resources	34.3%	24
membership growth	28.6%	20
Career Options magazine	11.4%	8
web services	11.4%	8
Other:	7.1%	5
revenue generating activities	2.9%	2
vendor marketplace	0.0%	0
answered question		70
skipped question		1

The most interesting elements of Question 3 are the responses to the catch-basin option of *Other*. Of fifteen suggestions, eight related to Professional Development, four related to Research, and four related to Networking (one overlapped between PD and Research) See the Appendix for the full list. The common theme across all three groupings could be described as “More”. Members want more PD, and they want it outside of the usual locations. They seek more opportunities to engage in networking in diverse locations. They also want CACEE to invest in research, and to catalogue and share the information we find.

A final observation on the results of Question 3 – CACEE asked members to identify their top four priorities, and the members provided them. Recently, CACEE Board members identified their top four priorities.

Table 11 Member Priorities - Board Priorities

Top Four Member Priorities	Top Four Board Priorities
a. Professional development events	1. Membership Growth
b. Networking/relationship building activities	2. Branding
c. Research/information services	3. Learning / PD
d. Subject matter expertise	4. Stewardship

It seems there is limited congruence here, but that assumption may be not quite accurate. Consider Board Priority Membership Growth. In the list of member priorities it comes in 7th place, which would be quite divergent. But if one considers why the Board prioritized membership growth, which included the desire to bring new and different people into the organization, one could argue that Board Priority Membership Growth matches well with Member Priority Networking/Relationship Building. Member Priorities a, c, and d are contained within the Board Strategic Priority of Learning / PD. That would leave Board Priorities Branding and Stewardship as outliers, but given that Branding and Stewardship weren't on the list provided to members, one need not be surprised that members did not identify them as priorities.

Conclusions

As previously established, Question 3 asks members to provide opinions about where CACEE should place its priorities in the future. Their opinions about CACEE's projected priorities align with their opinions about CACEE's current efforts, so the recommendations from Question 3 reinforce those from Questions 1 & 2.

Final Thoughts

CACEE is fortunate to have members who value the work it does as an Association and who are willing to take time from busy schedules to participate in surveys of this nature. These exercises provide the Association with valuable data while they provide members with an opportunity to participate in determining future direction, a win: win by any measure. CACEE must seek balance, though, in the frequency and size of member surveys, being careful not to abuse members' goodwill through over-surveying. The Benchmark Survey is an annual effort, and any additional initiatives should be considered with that fact established.

Where to go next?

Mindful of that need for balance, the conclusion of this Report is a good place to consider where we might proceed next with data collection. From the findings, it is clear that the membership values research and information, and would support efforts to deliver such services. Data from this survey indicates that one area of particular interest for members relates to best practices within campus career centres. The request for this type of effort positioned it as a partner to the annual Benchmark survey. CACEE may wish to consider how it might deliver such a Report for the benefit of its members.

Appendix A



CACEE

Membership Satisfaction Survey 2012

1. "The Canadian Association of Career Educators and Employers (CACEE) is a national non-profit partnership of employer recruiters and career services professionals. Our mission is to provide authoritative information, advice, professional development opportunities and other services to employers, career services professionals, and students." Do you believe that CACEE is achieving it's mission?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Strongly agree	14.1%	10
Agree	60.6%	43
Neutral	25.4%	18
Disagree	0.0%	0
Strongly Disagree	0.0%	0
Comments:		9
answered question		71
skipped question		0

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think there should also be an emphasis on the West and different PD and networking opportunities held in the West as well.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I found last years CACEE conference mediocre. I also am not sure it is providing the type of information that is relevant and helpful for Career Centres or employers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeliness can be an issue...i.e., statement on unpaid internships has been needed for some time, conference details are often not available early enough, association needs to increase employer membership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think it is achieving its mission but I don't think CACEE is very good at letting other people/organizations know.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think CACEE is doing a good job on the above, but support and information to career services professionals could be more cutting edge and dynamic (ie. more like CERIC). Also, not sure what CACEE is doing for students.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe that we have some amazing connections and the resources that come to everyone are very well done. I think we have some work to do to broaden our reach into more sectors of employment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think the people that volunteer with CACEE are great people that work very hard. If I could make a suggestion though, it would be to perhaps give a higher profile to the Recruiters and corporate feedback, requirements, job predictions for their organizations, etc. I feel that CACEE does a good job of facilitating communications between the schools, but outside of the conferences, I don't hear much from our employer partners.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a real "clique" feel to CACEE events which I think well prevent them from broadening in scope and bringing new people in.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the expense of membership, there is very little provided for members save for the conferences, which of course we have to pay for. CACEE needs to be more like NACE.

2. For the following CACEE services/activities, please evaluate: 1) the current quality/effectiveness; 2) how important or valuable the service is to you (regardless of the level of current quality/effectiveness).

NETWORKING/RELATIONSHIP BUILDING OPPORTUNITIES

a. National Conference Networking Sessions

Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	1	17	26	16	9	3.95	69
Importance/value	0	1	8	26	29	6	4.30	70
answered question								71
skipped question								0

b. Ontario Regional Conference Networking Sessions

Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	1	19	11	7	30	3.56	69
Importance/value	1	2	8	19	11	28	3.90	69
answered question								70
skipped question								1

c. Stand Alone Networking Events (i.e. Employer/Educator Roundtable, PD Events)

Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	13	19	23	2	12	3.25	69
Importance/value	0	6	15	30	11	8	3.74	70
answered question								70
skipped question								1

d. Marketplace (access to vendors and member discounts)

Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	4	10	34	10	1	11	2.90	70
Importance/value	4	9	32	14	2	9	3.02	70
answered question								71
skipped question								0

e. Overall									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	3	27	33	3	3	3.55	69	
Importance/value	0	0	18	32	15	4	3.95	69	
<i>answered question</i>									71
<i>skipped question</i>									0

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES									
f. Career Educator 101 / Recruiter 101 Programs									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	3	16	10	3	37	3.33	70	
Importance/value	0	1	12	21	9	27	3.88	70	
<i>answered question</i>									71
<i>skipped question</i>									0

g. Webinars									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	5	21	22	6	14	3.49	69	
Importance/value	0	1	21	29	11	9	3.81	71	
<i>answered question</i>									71
<i>skipped question</i>									0

h. PD Events (1 day or 1/2 day events, Roundtables, etc.)									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	7	23	18	3	18	3.29	70	
Importance/value	0	3	18	29	9	12	3.75	71	
<i>answered question</i>									71
<i>skipped question</i>									0

i. Website (online directories, career fair calendar, etc.)									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	2	8	26	20	5	9	3.30	70	
Importance/value	0	2	20	24	18	7	3.91	71	
<i>answered question</i>									71
<i>skipped question</i>									0

j. Overall									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	4	34	26	2	2	3.39	68	
Importance/value	0	0	22	33	13	2	3.87	70	
answered question									70
skipped question									1

RESEARCH / KNOWLEDGE SHARING / BEST PRACTICES									
k. Research/information services (CACEE Campus Recruitment and Benchmark Survey)									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	2	19	30	15	4	3.88	70	
Importance/value	0	0	13	27	27	4	4.21	71	
answered question									71
skipped question									0

l. Career Options Magazine									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	4	4	15	33	9	5	3.60	70	
Importance/value	3	5	15	32	11	5	3.65	71	
answered question									71
skipped question									0

m. www.careeroptionsmagazine.com									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	3	6	11	21	8	20	3.51	69	
Importance/value	2	4	11	28	10	15	3.73	70	
answered question									70
skipped question									1

n. Awards Program (Regional Awards, Outstanding Contribution, Moe Ktytor Award of Merit, etc.)									
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count	
Current Quality/Effectiveness	2	6	21	21	7	12	3.44	69	
Importance/value	2	9	16	24	9	10	3.48	70	
answered question									70
skipped question									1

o. Overall								
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	3	29	23	4	6	3.47	65
Importance/value	0	3	19	30	9	6	3.74	67
answered question								67
skipped question								4

COMMUNICATIONS								
p. CACEE Connect (e-newsletter)								
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	8	17	35	6	2	3.55	69
Importance/value	0	2	23	34	8	2	3.72	69
answered question								70
skipped question								1

q. E-mail blasts (Targeted messages to members)								
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	9	22	28	3	6	3.40	68
Importance/value	0	5	19	34	7	4	3.66	69
answered question								69
skipped question								2

r. Social Media Initiatives (Twitter, LinkedIn Groups, Facebook)								
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	1	11	23	16	5	14	3.23	70
Importance/value	2	7	20	25	7	10	3.46	71
answered question								71
skipped question								0

s. Overall								
Answer Options	Very Low	Low	Moderate	High	Very High	N/A	Rating Average	Response Count
Current Quality/Effectiveness	0	3	26	29	4	4	3.55	66
Importance/value	1	3	20	35	7	4	3.67	70
Comments (related to question 2):								11

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current format of the newsletter is not as effective as it could be - things don't grab my attention - even when they are important.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see PD events/conference information (ie. program content & registration) earlier.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there any networking events happening outside of Ontario? The website is very poorly laid out and not very helpful.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I plan my schedule months in advance - last minute webinars and events are not on my radar. There are not enough round table discussions. The CACEE e-newsletter is too small to read and boring to look at. CACEE is ineffective in their social media usage.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where I indicated N/A is due to either not being able to access or not having time to access.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarking survey is good, but am more interested in research related to practices/theories in career development and support. In other words, we need more support in being better educators.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In person PD events are not in our budget.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CACEE doesn't have much of a social media identity currently... I think there needs to be a game plan that fits with the current & target demographic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some variety in topics at conferences would be good. Sometimes we tend to see same people with the same message.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I have participated in the first three Career Educator modules and I was disappointed as some of the information was repetitive and not new to me. I would like to see advanced professional development opportunities for members. I have not seen the results of the benchmark survey and would be interested in other events where career centres can learn about/share resources with other schools (eg: a virtual shared drive where you can put presentations, handouts, activities) or a virtual webinar/roundtable where people can join in once or twice a year and topic about important issues related to career services/recruitment. CACEE conference was a fabulous networking opportunity and I would like to see more events throughout the year or virtual ways for career centres to connect directly with recruiters.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newsletter format is not inviting to read. Have to scroll too much. Too many email blasts and again, not very attractive or consistent in quality

3. In what areas would you like to see CACEE place priority over the next three years? (Select no more than four)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
membership growth	27.1%	19
networking/relationship building activities	61.4%	43
professional development events	72.9%	51
conferences	38.6%	27
web resources	32.9%	23
research/information services	51.4%	36
web services	8.6%	6
vendor marketplace	0.0%	0
Career Options magazine	11.4%	8
subject matter expertise	48.6%	34
revenue generating activities	2.9%	2
Other:	4.3%	3
answered question		70

Please provide specific ideas for growth and/or general comments:

Answer Options	Response Count
	15
answered question	15
skipped question	56

Responses

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a member of CACEE far removed from the greater or lesser Toronto I would like to see more PD web based learning opportunities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From a career centre perspective, more research/information/discussion around best practices and challenges we are facing with Canadian recruitment practices, skill development of students, emerging trends etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I attend a couple of webinars a year but am unable to make it out to Toronto or Ottawa because of the associated costs. It would be nice to have a more active chapter here in the West for PD / best practices sharing opportunities. Almost all events are held in eastern Canada which makes it very difficult to participate with others in the industry face-to-face.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skill development sessions.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps allow key non-member employers to experience some aspects of a conference free of charge to promote membership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I find that CACEE is behind the ball in terms of content and not addressing the really big hot topic questions in the industry.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower cost for webinars. Turn webinars into online library of videos viewable at any time. Turn Recruiter 101/ Career Educator 101 into online tutorial available at anytime. Use the webinars to address specific challenges for new members. I didn't see or hear of any round tables this year in the Ontario region. There could be case study examples of topics that come up all the time like, unpaid internships, student entrepreneurial companies etc. again in library format so members can refer. More way in managing & sharing knowledge of member instead of starting from scratch every year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CACEE needs to look be more active on-line. small surveys, large surveys (such as the salary one) and other similar are useful but not if no one knows about them aside from the membership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invite outside industry specialists to the national conference. The learning that we share from peer to peer can be done through the networking. Also tap into specialists from US universities since the US Career Services is much more advanced than Canada. Suggest to use MBACSC as a starting point.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provincially based PD days not only help with PD in the regions, but also helps with regional collegiality. Also a great way to raise CACEE's profile. Might also be useful to have some events just for employers and others just for educators.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are heavily developed in the financial services/institutions sectors. We should consider branching out into more traditional sectors, like manufacturing, heavy industries, etc. where

demand for grads and co-op is high (engineering, for example).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broaden the scope of keynote presenters brought in. PD events need to be better facilitated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Virtual roundtables where members can sign in and discuss topics (I know that the business school directors have regular meetings - it be great to see a CACEE member take initiative for career professionals who deal with international students, or work with internship/co-op programs or work within a business school career centre and have an opportunity to share best practices. I like to see advanced professional development available for career professionals - perhaps bring in an external facilitator to train on coaching. Some members may have accessed these workshops on their own with PD support from their organization, but if this was made available to CACEE members perhaps a discounted rate could be offer which allows members to participate in PD more frequently/use PD allowance more freely.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good salary survey - important tool that is worth the membership.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When I first became a member of CACEE, I felt a bit intimidated when attending the national conference and networking events/sessions. There appeared to be many well-established CACEE members who were heavily involved, but I found some of these individuals/groups of individuals to be intimidating rather than welcoming. I am very glad that I stayed involved with CACEE because I really enjoy being a member - I get a lot of value from it. I just wish my introduction to CACEE was more positive - perhaps there is an opportunity to create a mentoring/partner system where new members get paired with more established members in their first year - someone they go to with questions, etc. This might also generate more interest from new members to volunteer with CACEE if they know more about the organization earlier on and if they feel they have established a bit of a connection with the organization.

4. While it is not mandatory, we would like to know a little bit about who replies to this survey. If you are willing to provide identity information your name will be entered into a draw for one free admission to a Regional PD Event or National Webinar of your choosing. Please let us know who you are:

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
First Name	88.9%	24
Last Name	88.9%	24
Title	92.6%	25
Organization	92.6%	25
Department	70.4%	19
How long have you been a member of CACEE?	96.3%	26
answered question		27
skipped question		44

Names
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stacey Smith
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linda Gully
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rodney Larmand
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linda Hart
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Griffith D'Souza
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Michelle Floyd
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kevin Bolen
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beverly Stevens
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lorrie Quigg
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tony Botelho
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Theresa Myra

• Kavita Kara
• Gilles LeBlanc
• Shannon Costigan
• Jane MacDonald
• Amy Elder
• Dena Honig
• Lisa Lewkowicz
• Cynthia Grahame
• Lianne Gagne
• Lisa Kuiper
• Rob Shea
• Nancy Moulday
• Patricia Poirier

Title
• Recruiter
• Director, BCom Career Services
• President
• Assistant Director
• Career Advisor
• Employer Services Assistant
• Career Educator
• Director, Student Employment & Engagement
• Manager
• Career Educator
• MBA Relationship Manager
• Employer Development Manager
• Manager, Campus Recruitment
• Manager, Sprott Career Services Centre
• Sr. Campus Recruitment Partner
• Manager
• Director
• Career Advisor
• Relationship Manager
• Senior Manager, Human Resources
• Student Employment Officer
• Employer Development/Events & Marketing Coordinator
• Deputy Provost (Students)
• Manager Recruitment
• Employer Development Coordinator

Organization
• Teck Resources
• Sauder School of Business
• College Pro
• University of Guelph
• UWO
• Ryerson University
• University of Victoria
• University of Regina
• University of Victoria
• McGill
• Simon Fraser University
• Dalhousie University
• Scotiabank
• Sprott School of Business
• BMO
• St. Francis Xavier University
• Brock University
• University of Guelph
• University of Toronto
• IC Axon Inc
• Nipissing University
• Brock University
• Memorial University
• TD Business Banking
• Memorial University

Department
• Central Recruiting Office
• Business Career Centre
• Co-operative Education & Career Services
• Career Development & Employment Centre
• Co-op and Career
• Student Affairs
• Business
• Career Services and Volunteer Services
• Science Co-operative Education
• Global Banking and Markets HR
• Student Career Centre & Co-op Education
• Career Services

• Co-Operative Education and Career services
• Rotman
• Administration
• Office of Student Development and Services
• Career Services
• HR
• Career Development and Experiential Learning

How long have you been a member of CACEE?
• 6 years
• 1 year
• total of about 10 years I think
• 3 years
• 4 years
• 2 years
• 7 years
• 2 years
• 1 year
• 15 years
• 2+ years
• 9 years
• 3+ years
• 3
• 8 months
• 2 years
• since 2001? or 2002?
• 12 (not exactly sure)
• 1 year
• 1 year
• about 10 years
• 5 years
• 10 years
• 20 years (I think)
• 14
• 2 years

Please offer any additional comments:

Answer Options

Response Count

	8
answered question	8
skipped question	63

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No thanks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you to the team who tirelessly keeps CACEE viable and effective.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your efforts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new member and not sure what would be of most value to me/the organization.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, I'm very happy with the work CACEE has been doing!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for taking the time to gauge members input!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CACEE conference was well organized. I did not have a chance to participate in the social but I heard that they were fun.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing is happening in Montreal.



Sondage sur la satisfaction des membres de l'ACSEE

Sondage sur la satisfaction des membres de l'ACSEE

1. « L'Association canadienne des spécialistes en emploi et des employeurs (ACSEE) est un partenariat national sans but lucratif entre des employeurs recruteurs et des professionnels de l'emploi. Notre mission est de fournir des informations, des conseils, des occasions de perfectionnement professionnel et d'autres services aux employeurs, les professionnels des services de carrière et les étudiants. » Pensez-vous que l'ACSEE accomplit sa mission?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
fortement d'accord	0.0%	0
d'accord	80.0%	4
neutre	20.0%	1
en désaccord	0.0%	0
fortement en désaccord	0.0%	0
Commentaires:		1
<i>answered question</i>		5
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Commentaires

- Depuis mon adhésion, j'ai jamais eu une personne qui est venu vers moi pour me demander mon avis sur le support que j'ai reçu ou me demander si j'avais eu un guide quelconque.

2. Pour les services et activités suivants offerts par l'ACSEE, veuillez évaluer ce qui suit : 1) la qualité/efficacité actuelle; 2) l'importance ou l'utilité du service pour vous (peu importe le niveau de qualité / d'efficacité actuel).

OCCASIONS DE RÉSEAUTAGE / D'ÉTABLISSEMENT DE LIENS

a. Séances de réseautage au Congrès national

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s.o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.50	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	3	1	0	4.25	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

b. Séances de réseautage au Congrès régional de l'Ontario

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s.o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	1	0	0	4	3.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	0	0	3	3.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

c. Activités de réseautage autonomes (par exemple, table rondes, autres événements de perfectionnement professionnel)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	3	1	0	1	3.25	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	3	0	0	3.75	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

d. Marché (accès aux fournisseurs et aux rabais pour les membres)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.75	5
Importance/valeur	0	2	1	1	0	0	2.75	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

e. Aperçu global

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	1	0	2	2	0	0	3.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	4	0	0	4.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

ACTIVITÉS DE PERFECTIONNEMENT PROFESSIONNEL

f. Programmes Carrière 101 et Recruteur 101

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

g. Webinaires

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.67	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	3	0	1	4.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

h. Activités de perfectionnement professionnel (activités d'une journée ou d'une demi-journée, tables rondes, etc.)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.50	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	4	0	0	4.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

i. Site Web (répertoires en ligne, calendrier du salon de l'emploi, etc.)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.50	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	3	0	0	3.75	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

j. Aperçu global

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	1	3	1	0	0	3.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	3	0	0	3.75	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

RECHERCHE / PARTAGE DES CONNAISSANCES / PRATIQUES EXEMPLAIRES

k. Services de recherche / d'information (Enquête de référence sur le recrutement sur le campus de l'ACSEE)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	1	0	2	1	0	1	2.75	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.67	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

l. Magazine Options Carrières

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.60	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	2	2	0	4.50	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

m. www.careeroptionsmagazine.com

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	0	0	2	3	5.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	0	0	2	2	5.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

n. Programme de prix (Reconnaissance régional, Réalisations remarquables, Prix du mérite (Prix Moe Kytör), etc.)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	4	0	0	0	3.00	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

o. Aperçu global

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	3	1	0	1	3.25	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	3	0	0	3.75	4
<i>answered question</i>								5
<i>skipped question</i>								0

COMMUNICATIONS p. Liaison ACSEE (bulletin électronique)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s. o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	1	2	2	0	0	3.20	5

Importance/valeur	0	0	2	2	0	0	3.50	4
answered question								5
skipped question								0

q. Pluri-courriels (Messages ciblés destinés aux membres)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s.o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	1	0	2	2	0	0	3.00	5
Importance/valeur	0	0	3	1	0	0	3.25	4
answered question								5
skipped question								0

r. Initiatives relatives aux médias sociaux (Twitter, LinkedIn Groups, Facebook)

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s.o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	0	0	3	0	0	1	3.00	4
Importance/valeur	1	0	2	1	0	1	2.75	5
answered question								5
skipped question								0

s. Aperçu global

Answer Options	très faible	faible	modérée	élevée	très élevée	s.o.	Rating Average	Response Count
Qualité/efficacité actuelle	1	0	2	1	0	0	2.75	4
Importance/valeur	0	0	1	2	0	0	3.67	3
Autres commentaires (à propos de question 2)								0
answered question								4
skipped question								1

3. Dans quels secteurs aimeriez-vous que l'ACSEE mette l'accent au cours des trois prochaines années? (Sélectionnez un maximum de quatre secteurs.)

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
augmentation du nombre de membres	20.0%	1
activités de réseautage / d'établissement de liens	40.0%	2
activités de perfectionnement professionnel	60.0%	3
conférences	20.0%	1

ressources Web	20.0%	1	
services de recherche / d'information	20.0%	1	
services Web	20.0%	1	
marché des fournisseurs	0.0%	0	
magazine Options Carrières	0.0%	0	
expertise dans le domaine	20.0%	1	
activités génératrices de recettes	0.0%	0	
autre:	40.0%	2	
	answered question		5
	skipped question		0

Autre:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Augmenter le nombre de membres francophones.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fournir des services personnalisés aux nouveaux members.

Veillez fournir des idées précises pour la croissance et/ou des commentaires généraux :

Answer Options	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	2

Commentaires
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuer vos efforts à offrir des services en français.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment allez chercher l'intérêt des jeunes pour le marché du travail, motivation des étudiants.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More meetings with career centres.

4. Bien que vous ne soyez pas tenu de répondre aux questions suivantes, nous aimerions en savoir un peu sur le répondant. Si vous êtes disposé à fournir des renseignements sur l'identité, vous serez inscrit à un tirage pour gagner une entrée gratuite à une activité régionale de perfectionnement professionnel ou à un webinaire de votre choix. Veuillez nous fournir les renseignements suivants :

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Prénom	50.0%	1
Nom	50.0%	1
Titre	50.0%	1
Organisme	50.0%	1
Service	50.0%	1
Depuis combien d'années êtes-vous membre de l'ACSEE?	100.0%	2
	answered question	2
	skipped question	3

Nom
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marie-Eve Perron

Titre
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conseillère en information professionnelle

Organisme
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • université du Québec à Trois-Rivières

Service
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service aux étudiants

Depuis combien d'années êtes-vous membre de l'ACSEE?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 an
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 ans

24. Veuillez fournir tout commentaire supplémentaire.

	Response Count
	0
answered question	0
skipped question	5