

## 2012 QUESTIONNAIRE/SURVEY—PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Yes, UBCAPE has “done” this before. In 2006 the Association distributed a questionnaire to all **1256** Emeritus Faculty and Librarians and received **278** replies. Of those responding then **222 (80%)** were APE members.

### What were our goals for this survey?

1. What impact do our members have on UBC and the “world”? With more information about our UBC involvement a convincing case can be made that the Administration should invest more in AEP.
2. What do our members like, what we should do more of and what we might add to make membership more attractive? We need to be aware of what members think, act on their suggestions and keep them informed.
3. Can we increase our membership/revenue by adding members? To do that we need to find out why non-members haven’t joined or remained members. This survey was viewed as complementary to the creation of APE departmental/faculty network reps in this regard.

**So what happened this spring as far as potential respondents are concerned?** Well, 200 or so ‘paper’ versions of the survey were distributed to members with their spring newsletter and 30 more were distributed to the members of our network of departmental reps. A web based / online version was also created and went on line on the APE web page and its URL was also listed in the newsletter. **153** people filled out the survey (**97** did the paper version and **56** others filled it out online). Of the respondents, **146 were members of APE** and **7** were nonmembers. According to Don Russell and Bonnie Long, we had **415** APE members at the time. **Hence, while our return rate with respect to members was very good (36%), it was not good as far as nonmembers were concerned. In the next few newsletters we’ll present the findings; in the meantime, the entire report is on the APE webpage itself.**

***What is APE currently doing that respondents value?*** There were lots of positive responses to many activities.

***Table 1: What do you value? (in order of the percentage of “very valuable” positive responses)***

	<u>Very valuable</u>	<u>Somewhat Valuable</u>	<u>Not valuable, Ignored</u>
<i>Protection of current perks (e.g., parking)</i>	77%	11%	12%
<i>Five Association newsletters</i>	68	27	5
<i>Info on alternate medical/travel insurance</i>	58	16	26
<i>APE general meeting programs</i>	54	27	23
<i>Advocacy for new benefits</i>	37	30	33
<i>Special interest sessions</i>	36	30	34
<i>Social opportunities at meetings</i>	33	31	36
<i>Tutorials (e.g., library)</i>	27	32	41
<i>Social gatherings (e.g., wine and cheese)</i>	25	36	39
<i>Arranged visits (e.g., Truimf)</i>	23	30	47
<i>Info on APE web page</i>	20	38	42
<i>APE office/staff</i>	29	31	49
<i>Green Colleague Scholar Program</i>	13	25	62

**While all in the list are seen as having significant value to many members, the items on the list did separate themselves into three groupings of perceived value.**

---

## Report # 2 About the UBCAPE Survey

This is the second story highlighting findings of the APE survey that 146 members filled out. The entire report is on the APE webpage ([www.ubcemeriti.org](http://www.ubcemeriti.org)), as is the opportunity to do the survey online if you have so far missed your chance to participate.

### 1. One the questions we asked was whether retirees had a degree from UBC.

Again (surprisingly for me), 49 (32%) of the 152 had UBC degrees. When asked if they were active in Alumni Affairs 14 (26%) of the 49 indicated they were active. Thirty eight (25%) of the members responding indicated they were female, which is consistent with our membership records and helps give one confidence that our respondents are representative of our membership.

### 2. In what year did our respondents retire?

1990 or before	23 (15.0%)	2001–2006	44(28.9%)
1991–1995	25 (16.3%)	2007–2011	30(19.5%)
1996–2000	31 (20.3%)		

*Interestingly, that distribution is virtually the same as it was when the survey was done in 2006.*

### 3. How involved are Emeriti in UBC activities? Very . . .

Eight-five of our respondents (55.5%) indicated they were currently involved in UBC activities. Of those (68) that were not, 28 (41%) indicated they had been active 5 years ago and cited the nature of their involvement (the pattern of which looked the same those currently active).

### 4. What was the nature of the current involvement?

Forty-five (53%) were involved in academic research, 43 (51%) in course teaching or/and student supervision 30 (36%) were doing student or faculty coaching/mentoring, 29 (34%) were doing administration (Departmental, Faculty, or University), 27 (32%) were engaged in FOGS-initiated PHD oral examinations, 20 (24%) were participating in Grad ceremonies, and

9 (10%) were involved in UBC Fund Raising and 12 (15%) in other activities (e.g., cataloguing and doing presentations at the Museum of Anthropology).

### 5. What about their current activities as members of government or professional boards, as in academic or nonprofit agencies, profit-making companies or involvement in the executives of community-based organizations?

Impressively, 71 (49%) listed a wide range of such involvement. These included serving on the Boards of several national and international scientific organizations, a national Charitable Organization, the Vancouver Foundation, United Way; editing academic journals; appointments as Visiting professors at overseas universities; serving as grant reviewers for international, provincial, and national agencies; being Dean of a Medical school in Kenya; serving on the Executive of several local Shareholder, Strata, Choir, and Church societies, on B.C. government boards, such as Transport Action BC, DQAB (which oversees the quality of the degrees/programs offered by private universities operating in the province), etc., etc.

6. In retrospect, the response to the question as to which UBC activities you might enjoy being involved in suggest that question might have been confusing. If you were involved in something currently, would you bother citing it again? In any event, 69 responses from the 33% of those responding were collected.

Of the 11 choices, the most popular choices among the folks who responded were serving on selection committees for awards (40%), departmental/faculty consulting/administration (38%), serving as a reader/evaluator of new undergrad applications (25%), teaching/student supervising (20%), coaching/mentoring new faculty (22%) and campus planning (18.6%). There were some (albeit each less than 10% of the responses) for the other choices (e.g., mentoring new students, fund raising, search committees for administrators).

---

Report # 3 About the Survey, continued

*While all in the list are seen as having significant value to many members, the items on the list did separate themselves into the above three groupings of perceived value.*

**3. We also asked a follow-up question on the value placed on certain features of the newsletter:**

Table 2. Value and the newsletter

	Very Valuable	Somewhat Valuable	Not Valuable/ Ignored
Announcements of Meetings and Program	77%	10%	13%
News about members' awards and activities	51	30	19
Announcements of other UBC events	61	27	12
Getting a Print Copy by mail * Paper folks	65	16	19
Online Folks	9	11	80

**• There were two instances in which those taking the paper version differed from those doing the survey online. This is one of them: Those filling out the paper version wanted to get their newsletter by mail. Those doing the online version of the survey didn't value receiving the print copy.**

**•The other difference between the two kinds of responder involved when they retired. Not surprisingly more of the" paper "respondents retired before 1995.**