Agenda Item 1-III.A.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 6, 2012
San Diego, California

Discussion: Plan for Following Up on Member Needs and Satisfaction Survey

**(Prepared by: Terry Baxter, Elisabeth Kaplan,
Donna McCrea, and Kate Theimer)**

BACKGROUND

At its June meeting, the Council had a preliminary discussion about the results of the Member Needs and Satisfaction Survey. The majority of that conversation revolved around how to release the survey results to the membership. Given the volume and complexity of the data, the Council determined that more time would need to be devoted to understanding the implications of the survey results and determining how SAA should act on them. Council members Donna McCrea and Kate Theimer volunteered to propose a plan for how the Council could undertake this analysis. The Council also decided to engage in an ongoing discussion with the membership about the survey results via a blog. Council members Elisabeth Kaplan and Kate Theimer, with Brian Doyle, volunteered to draft a plan for developing content and managing this blog.

DISCUSSION

Given that the Council had determined that moving forward to examine the survey results should be done quickly, McCrea and Theimer proposed a plan via the Council discussion list on June 25 (see Appendix). There was limited response to this plan on the discussion list, but no concerns were raised about its basic structure. The impetus to complete the analysis by the August meeting appears to have been unrealistic. However, the Council still needs to engage with the survey results and determine how SAA should respond to them. Ideally this should be completed in time to inform the beginning of a new strategic planning cycle in January 2013.

As far as disseminating the survey results and engaging in a dialogue with members about them, in July Vice President Jackie Dooley initiated the creation of a “leadership blog.” This blog is designed to serve as a vehicle for the Vice President and members of Council to communicate directly and less formally with the membership. Creation of this blog appears to have superseded plans to create a separate blog to use for discussion of the membership survey.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Does the plan proposed in the Appendix appear to be the best way for the Council to analyze the survey results and their implications? Should the categories be different? Are there better ways to approach this task?

2. What should be the schedule for conducting this work? Is it feasible to ask Council members to complete their work by October 15, 2012? This date would give plenty of time to develop an agenda item for the January 2013 meeting and to develop content for new blog posts seeking member input.

Appendix

Council Tasks to Analyze Member Survey Results

At its June 2012 meeting the Council discussed the results of the Member Needs and Satisfaction Survey (see Agenda Item 0612-IV-B for background). The Council determined that a more detailed review of specific parts of the survey data could help inform the discussion of next steps. Kate Theimer and Donna McCrea were tasked with identifying areas for further review.

They suggest that, in groups of two, the Council (including incoming members) should investigate and report on the following areas:

1. Perception of Council
   - What are we doing well, what can we improve? Is there low-hanging fruit? Are we just not communicating well enough?

2. Perception of Strategic Initiatives
   - Is this because people do not know about the strategic initiatives, do not like them, or do not think we are accomplishing goals? Can this information be gleaned from the data?

3. Perception of Member Benefits
   - Can we determine what might increase value / understanding of these benefits?
   - Review and analyze suggestions for new benefits (comment field Q13) and responses to Q5 (why I may not renew membership).

4. Perception of Publications
   - What gets high marks? What are some areas for improvement?

5. Perception of Continuing Education
   - What gets high marks and by whom? When low marks are given, why? Not the right offerings, not enough value for the money, not offered enough, not offered in the right places?

6. Open comment fields
   - Q45: More information on problems encountered.
   - Q48: If you could suggest one thing to improve the benefits, products or services you receive from SAA, what would you suggest?
   - Q55: Do you have any additional comments that you would like to share with SAA?

Areas Not Being Addressed in This Effort:

- Dues (focus instead on articulating value of membership).
- SAA Staff (because perceptions are high – just skim comments for any areas of concern).
- Perception of Annual Meeting (give comments / information to AMTF).
- Responses from Institutional and Dual members (should be given to Membership Committee).
- Responses to open comment fields Q3 (What makes you hesitant to recommend SAA?). [Note that the people working on Area #6 might choose to look at these.]
- Responses to questions regarding why individuals choose to belong (see Slide 31). [Possible area for exploration with members via the blog to gather more detail on how people define those motivations.]

Assumptions:

- For this exercise we are just delving deeper into the analysis provided by the consultant, which we acknowledge is just one way to look at the results.

Additional Tasks for Staff:

- The demographic data about the survey respondents should be compared to the available data about the membership as a whole to identify differences and variations and <u>included as an appendix in the August discussion item</u>. (See attached.)

Task:

- Each group will produce a 2- to 3-page analysis of their area (as represented in the consultant's report, the aggregate data, and the responses to any relevant open-ended questions), including:
    - A summary of the questions and responses,
    - What they see as the most important areas to respond to,
    - A prioritized list of possible action items and rough analysis of anticipated impact on other areas (pro and con) of making these changes,
    - A summary of member comments (if any relevant to the area),
    - Discussion of any additional information needed to make a decision
- To be completed by July 13 and submitted to [to be determined] so that findings can be compiled for Discussion Item for August meeting.

Comparison of Demographic Data

Per the preceding appendix, "Council Tasks to Analyze Member Survey Results," staff was charged to compare demographic data about survey respondents against available data about the membership as a whole to identify differences and variations. Existing data on member age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, and employment status are incomplete, and therefore a comparison on these variables is not possible.

Comparison of Individual Member Type/Subtype

	Survey Respondents	Members Active as of January 2012	Variance
Assoc. Domestic	2%	3%	-1%
Assoc. Int'l	1%	1%	--
Bridge	2%	2%	--
Retired	2%	4%	-2%
Lifetime/Honorary	0%	0%	--
ID1 (< $20k/yr)	15%	17%	-2%
ID2 ($20k-$29k/yr)	5%	4%	1%
ID3 ($30k-$39k/yr)	10%	8%	2%
ID4 ($40k-$49k/yr)	13%	11%	3%
ID5 ($50k-$59k/yr)	12%	9%	3%
ID6 ($60k-$75k/yr)	9%	8%	1%
ID7 (> $75k/yr)	8%	7%	1%
Student	21%	26%	-5%

Analysis: Student members, retired members, and members earning less than $20k/year were slightly less likely to respond to the survey.

Comparison of Reported Salary vs. Individual Member Subtype

	<$20k	<$30k	<$40k	<$50k	<$60k	<$70k	<$80k	<$90k	<$100k	>$100k
Assoc. Domestic	13%	10%	**23%**	16%	16%	7%	13%	--	3%	--
Assoc. Int'l	7%	7%	--	7%	--	27%	13%	--	7%	**33%**
Bridge	61%	11%	11%	14%	4%	--	--	--	--	--
Retired	**45%**	3%	7%	3%	7%	7%	10%	7%	7%	3%
ID1 (< $20k/yr)	**38%**	17%	22%	14%	4%	4%	1%	1%	1%	0.5%
ID2 ($20k-$29k/yr)	4%	**35%**	32%	18%	7%	2%	1%	2%	--	--
ID3 ($30k-$39k/yr)	--	2%	**55%**	34%	7%	2%	0.5%	--	--	--
ID4 ($40k-$49k/yr)	0.5%	0.5%	2%	**62%**	28%	4%	3%	--	0.5%	--
ID5 ($50k-$59k/yr)	--	1%	1%	3%	**62%**	25%	5%	2%	0.5%	--
ID6 ($60k-$75k/yr)	--	--	--	1%	2%	**46%**	**40%**	8%	1%	2%
ID7 (> $75k/yr)	--	--	--	--	1%	1%	7%	22%	22%	**48%**
Student	**60%**	17%	11%	7%	2%	1%	1%	--	0.5%	0.5%

Analysis:
-- Associate members exhibit the greatest variation in annual incomes within the dues categories.
-- Members in the ID1 and ID2 dues categories appear most likely to under-report their incomes.
-- The distribution of incomes among ID7 members suggests that additional dues categories for higher earning members may be warranted.