



CSAAC Member Telephone Survey, September, 2006 Summary of Member Comments

The CSAAC Regional Directors conducted a telephone interview of members during September, 2006. The Board of Directors wishes to thank all members who participated in the survey. The Board is now using this information when making decisions on Association activities. A compilation of the comments follows:

1) Annual meetings

- a) Cost is a factor
 - Location close to analysts
 - Two to three days maximum
 - Use of weekend reduces workload problems at home
 - Difficulty sending more than one person from a lab – lab was represented by one analyst at the meeting.
 - Keep location always the same to keep cost constant.
 - Should be moderate hotel cost
 - CSAAC should pay the way
 - More would attend if could drive
- b) Need topics relevant to work
- c) Need constant reminders in advance
- d) Workshops very important to draw analysts
- e) Timing
 - June/July ok for most
 - Weekends ok for some, but not all.
 - Meeting every second year
 - At least 3 weeks between SCST and CSAAC
 - No interest in break in middle for tours
- f) Joint meetings with other organizations (CSGA, CSTA)
 - Good to have interaction with industry
 - May detract from CSAAC identity.
 - Easier to justify cost if joint meeting
 - Should not result in an increased cost to CSAAC
 - Makes the meeting too long
 - Could alternate, joint/CSAAC only
 - Joint meeting with SCST would be of interest
- g) Need good speakers.
- h) Activities which would be attractive
 - Input and voting on M&P
 - Dealing with topics relevant to lab, e.g. crop kinds
 - Voting on issues of importance
 - CFIA should be present
 - Updates on Rules, CFIA, CSI
- i) Members need advance information on meetings
 - Benefits of attending
 - What is the agenda
- j) Annual meetings good for networking.
- k) Vacation location generally not a drawing factor
- l) Language difficulties for members from Quebec
- m) Require attendance every 3-5 years to maintain membership

2) Breaking dormancy

- a) In general, good and widely read by members
- b) Expand to include more information
- c) Need to expand “did you know”
- d) Include quiz or crossword with answers in following issue
- e) Members are willing to contribute to “did you know” but are nervous people might not be interested or afraid it is wrong.

3) Workshops

- a) Very important
- b) One day, not more than two days
- c) Need to address current issues
- d) Don't be afraid to repeat
- e) Need to address industry needs
 - Varietal identification
 - Better pricing
 - Harmonizing M&P/AOSA
 - DNA testing
 - Quality systems
 - Staffing issues
 - Reduction of CFIA expertise
- f) Information distributed should be validated (issues not left in question)
- g) Need hands-on sharpening skills, eg. identifications
- h) Suggested topics
 - Reed canarygrass, Canada vs. US
 - Grasses, e.g. bromegrass
 - Vegetables
 - Weed ID, analyst and grader
 - Purity
 - Wheat
 - Kentucky bluegrass
 - Sampling
 - Fusarium, presented by Grain Commission
 - Seedling evaluation, e.g. corn and soybean
 - Trait tolerances
 - Motivational speaker
 - Workplace dynamics – improve efficiencies in lab
 - Onion – treated seed
 - Treated grasses – blower
 - Vigour
 - Tetrazolium
 - Diseases in germination test, e.g. small grains
 - Flower and vegetable testing by M&P
 - Forages
 - AOSA/M&P comparison – follow-up to previous workshop
 - Native seeds
 - Smut – with points towards CFIA accreditation
 - New problem weeds
 - Herbicide bioassay
 - Species separations – bluegrass, wheatgrass, Brassica, cereals, Lettuce, Clover, CPS/Durum
 - Dormancy breaking, e.g. spring wheat, perennials
 - Causes of abnormalities
- i) Possible resources
 - Olds college instructors

4) General

- a) Lack of training available
 - What is Saskatoon able to offer for exam training
 - Need for vegetable training
 - Should have a list of labs or analysts who offer training – on-site and correspondence
 - Need to develop training materials
 - Smut testing
 - Import Release training
 - Quality management and meeting accreditation requirements
 - Accreditation paperwork requirements
 - Diseases
 - M&P revisions
 - Training for reach accreditation outside company working for.
- b) Volunteers for CSAAC work
 - Costs (money, time) inhibit volunteering
 - Non-Senior analysts may not feel they are an important part of CSAAC
 - Need to be called
 - Need to be informed of what the position is
- c) As companies combine, there may be fewer labs and more analysts per lab, causing possible reduction in number of CSAAC members
 - Need to make more appealing for individuals
 - Make being a member a requirement to test seed
- d) Internet and email
 - More information
 - Interactive web site
 - Better links to CFIA website, as their website is confusing
 - More reports by email
- e) Develop a CSAAC crop kinds manual, which could be sold.
- f) Seed industry needs
 - Better pricing
 - M&P/AOSA Rules harmonization
 - Comparison for labs
- g) Lower membership fees.
- h) Point system
 - Difficult to get points
 - Improve tracking system to let members know their status
- i) Need to recognize importance of seed analysts – professional group
- j) CSAAC should be proactive and willing to change
- k) Keep visible – participation in CFIA, CSTA, CSGA, CSI meetings
- l) Member Survey
 - Telephone contact good,
 - Future surveys should be emailed first
- m) Identify a small number of experienced labs which could be used for seed identification.
- n) CSAAC could help analysts become graders
- o) Joint CSAAC/SCST board members
- p) CSAAC Continuing education requirements for RST members not clear
- q) Suggestion for Germination magazine article – Pure living seed
- r) Negative feelings
 - Intimidation
 - Education “forced down their throat”
 - CSAAC has too much power