



NALP Recruitment Survey: Full Summary

Calgary, Ottawa, Vancouver, and Toronto Articling 2024-2025

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
BACKGROUND	2
CURRENT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS	3
PROCESS FOR COMMUNICATING STUDENT FEEDBACK.....	3
RESPONDENTS.....	3
DEMOGRAPHICS	4
IDENTIFYING OPPORTUNITIES	5
Choosing where to apply.....	5
STUDENT WELL-BEING.....	6
CALGARY ARTICLING 2024-2025 RECRUITMENT.....	8
Awareness of Law Society of Alberta (LSA) Recruitment Rules	8
Interview Process Format Preferences	9
OTTAWA ARTICLING 2024-2025 RECRUITMENT	9
Awareness of Ottawa Law Student Recruitment Ethics Protocol.....	9
Social Events	10
VANCOUVER 2024-2025 ARTICLING RECRUITMENT.....	10
Awareness of Vancouver Bar Association Guidelines	10
Social Events	11
TORONTO 2024-2025 ARTICLING RECRUITMENT	11
Awareness of Law Society of Ontario (LSO) Recruitment Procedures.....	11
Social Events	12
APPENDIX A: COMPLETE SURVEY QUESTIONS.....	13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*This edition of the NALP Recruitment Survey canvasses feedback from students who participated in the **Calgary, Vancouver, Ottawa and Toronto articling recruitment processes for 2024-2025 articling positions.***

There were 118 law student respondents to the survey. Overarching themes in student feedback concerned the following:

- (1) Survey respondents (and, by extension, the larger group of applicants in this recruitment process) are exceptionally (and increasingly, as compared to recent past surveys) diverse, with **over 90% of respondents self-identifying with an equity-seeking group.***
- (2) An **increasing vast majority** of respondents (95.7%, up from 90.8% in the last survey round) reported that they did **not** experience any improper questions or comments in relation to their identification with/belonging to an equity-seeking group.*
- (3) There are **significant differences by market** in relation to respondents' (1) preferences for which components they would have liked to see included in the recruitment process, and (2) reports on the "most useful type of social event".*
- (4) We noted an **increase** in the percentage of respondents who reported being aware of the rules, guidelines and/or best practices associated with recruitment in each of the four markets, compared with the last survey round for this recruitment process.*
- (5) The number of respondents reporting employer conduct contrary to rules, guidelines and/or best practices has either **remained stable or decreased** in all four markets, compared with the last survey round.*
- (6) The number of respondents reporting an extremely high level of stress during this recruitment process is **down a couple of percentage points** when compared with the last survey round. However, the number of respondents reporting "no stress" is down as well, to zero (0).*

BACKGROUND

The NALP Recruitment Survey was developed by the Canadian Section of NALP to collect feedback on the structured summer and articling law student recruitment processes in major urban centres across Canada. NALP assisted in providing the survey technology and a small working group comprising school and employer representatives developed the survey questions in consultation with their colleagues.

The feedback from the survey is used by Canadian law school Career Services/Development Offices (CDOs) to better improve the recruitment experience of law students and legal employers by determining what is working well and what could be improved. Since student recruitment is regulated by either provincial law societies or local bar associations in the respective jurisdictions, and not by NALP, the purpose of the survey is not meant to identify and report breaches of the rules, but rather to be a tool for improvement.

This edition of the survey includes questions (which are reproduced in [Appendix A](#) of this report) regarding the Calgary, Vancouver, Ottawa and Toronto articling recruitment processes for 2024-2025 articling positions. Each Canadian law school CDO received a survey URL to send to its students shortly after the conclusion of the recruitment cycle, which was left open for approximately 2-3 weeks. Students were not asked for their name or law school when they completed the survey.

Feedback is welcomed in terms of how the survey might be improved going forward, both with regard to the survey questions and the process by which the survey results are communicated. Please contact one of the members of the NALP Recruitment Survey Working Group with your feedback.

CURRENT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

- **Maryanne Forrayi** – University of Calgary
- **Nicola Martin** – Osgoode Hall Law School
- **Christi McAuley** – Thompson Rivers University
- **Martha McClellan (on leave) & Ellen Sterns** – University of New Brunswick
- **Myriah Graves** – Fogler, Rubinoff LLP (Employer Advisor)
- **Jennifer Nadon (Chair)** – University of Ottawa

PROCESS FOR COMMUNICATING STUDENT FEEDBACK

To protect the confidentiality of respondents, the full survey results are **not** shared with any employer or student, including employer representatives on the NALP Recruitment Survey Working Group, any other working group or any CDO member who is not part of the working group. Only the law school CDO members of the NALP Recruitment Survey Working Group receive the full survey results in aggregate format from the NALP Research Associate.

In addition to this Summary Report, members of the Working Group will send / have sent individual reports to all employers who received specific comments from students, either positive comments or concerns. The employers will receive / have received the exact, verbatim comments made by students except where the comment expresses concern about employer behaviour using names, personal characteristics, and/or situations which could identify the student. Such comments may be redacted to protect student confidentiality, or a generic “Interviewer A” may be used.

RESPONDENTS

Total: **118**

Number of Respondents who applied to:

Calgary: **10**

Ottawa: **33**

Vancouver: **23**

Toronto: **79**

DEMOGRAPHICS

In response to the question “Do you belong to or identify with any of the following equity-seeking groups”, **only 7.8% of respondents selected “No”**, representing a decline of almost three percentage points after the last round of this survey (for 2023-2024 articling positions). This indicates an increasingly diverse pool of law school applicants in this process.

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
Women						72.4%	84
Racialized Persons or Visible Minorities						34.5%	40
LGBTQ2SA+						24.1%	28
First-generation Students (first in your immediate family to attend university)						24.1%	28
People with disabilities, whether permanent, temporary or episodic, evident or not						19.8%	23
People from an economically disadvantaged background						12.1%	14
No						7.8%	9
Student caregivers (dependents can include a minor child, aging parent or an adult with a disability)						3.4%	4
Indigenous Persons						1.7%	2
Prefer not to answer						0.9%	1
Other (please specify)						0.0%	0
# of Responses							116

An increasing majority of respondents **95.7%** (up from 90.8% after the last round) reported that they did **not** experience any improper questions or comments in relation to the above grounds.

Examples of improper questions and comments reported by the 5 respondents (4.3%) who did:

- “Multiple comments were made that started with “I know this isn’t politically correct, but...”
- “We encourage our clients not to hire people of colour or people with disabilities because they’re the ones who file human rights complaints.”

IDENTIFYING OPPORTUNITIES

Choosing where to apply

In response to the question “What factors most influenced your decision about which employers to apply to for a 2024-2025 articling position?”, respondents most often selected “**Specific practice area strengths**” (57.6%), “**Office location**” (53.4%), “**Employer’s culture**” (42.4%) and “**Salary**” (37.3%). These results are consistent with the last round of this survey (for 2023-2024 articling positions), where the same four factors topped the list.

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
Specific practice area strengths						57.6%	68
Office location (specific city or region)						53.4%	63
Employer's culture						42.4%	50
Salary/compensation						37.3%	44
Training opportunities						16.9%	20
Employer's hire back rate						16.1%	19
Input from family, friends, acquaintances, alumni or the Career Development Office						13.6%	16
Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion						12.7%	15
Employer's reputation on campus						8.5%	10
Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)						8.5%	10
Information about the employer found online						7.6%	9
Employer's published hiring criteria						5.1%	6
Employer events and receptions						4.2%	5
Benefits, including parental leave						3.4%	4
Employer's commitment to pro bono						3.4%	4
Other (please specify)						0.8%	1
# of Responses						118	

“Other” was specified as “Employer’s commitment to working on behalf of progressive causes”, “Prestige” and “Whether the employer worked in the public interest.”

STUDENT WELL-BEING

Just under half (47.9%) self-reported “Extremely high” levels of overall stress during this recruitment process, down slightly from 51.4% since the last round of this survey:

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
1 (None)						0.0%	0
2						2.6%	3
3						15.4%	18
4						34.2%	40
5 (Extremely high)						47.9%	56
						Mean	4.3
						# of Responses	117

No respondent selected “None” in rating their stress level.

When asked what type of information would ease stress levels ahead of interviews, **72.0%** of respondents chose “**Information about the type(s) of questions asked during the interview(s).**”

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
Information about the type(s) of questions asked during the interview(s) (e.g., behavioral)						72.0%	85
Information about the format of the interview(s) (e.g., length, number of interviewers, platform used)						61.9%	73
Intention to call emails ahead of interview offers						55.9%	66
Information about student outcomes in previous years						43.2%	51
Name(s) of interviewers						43.2%	51
Other (Please specify):						9.3%	11
None of the above						5.1%	6
						# of Responses	118

“Other” included:

- **Flexible scheduling options:** “Flexible interview times/dates, as I was working a full-time

2L job with an employer I am not articling with and had to repeatedly take time off work to interview elsewhere”, “Interview steps not communicated from the beginning; tight schedule with second round interviews”, “More interview days so it’s less chaotic, knowing it’s okay to reschedule interviews on call day.”

- **Salary information:** “Compensation details prior to offer day”, “Pay”, “Wages and benefits forced to be published with posting.”
- **Details about the hiring process and hiring criteria:** “Whether firms are interested in internationally trained lawyers”, “Amount of positions being filled or candidates at each stage”, “How many interviews are being conducted with other students, so I know my chances”, “Knowing it is mostly about grades”, “If a firm was going to schedule a dinner after the reception, to make that explicit beforehand for scheduling purposes.”
- **Details about post-articling opportunities with the employer:** “Career prospects for particular articling roles”, “Information on what it's like to join the organization after articling.”

“**Interview preparation**” was selected by respondents as the most helpful resource provided by law schools to help manage stress levels. In the last round of this survey, “**Review of application materials**” was most selected, at 44.8%:

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
Interview preparation						48.7%	57
Review of application materials						41.9%	49
Information sessions						41.0%	48
One-on-one career advising						40.2%	47
I did not use any resources provided by my law school						23.1%	27
Mentorship program						8.5%	10
Other (Please specify):						6.8%	8
Wellness advisors / mental health counselling						6.0%	7
# of Responses							117

“Other” included written guides for seeking articles and other informational documents, email communications with dates and procedures, and sample applications and interview questions.

When asked what initiatives offered by employers were helpful in managing stress during the recruitment process, the majority of students chose “**Clear, detailed and up-to-date information on the employer’s website**”, followed by “**Detailed job posting including information about salary/compensation.**” These results are consistent with the last round of this survey (for 2023-2024 articling positions), where the same two initiatives topped the list:

Response	20%	40%	60%	80%	100%	Frequency	Count
Clear, detailed and up-to-date information on the employer's website						54.4%	62
Detailed job posting including information about salary/compensation						47.4%	54
Timely notice when my candidacy is no longer being considered						42.1%	48
Flexibility with interview scheduling						36.0%	41
Informational interviews						19.3%	22
Open Houses						14.9%	17
I did not take advantage of any of the initiatives offered by employers.						9.6%	11
Other (Please specify):						7.0%	8
Pre-recruitment support (e.g. mock interviews, cv review)						6.1%	7
# of Responses							114

“Other” included “contact information of current and former articling students” or “networking with articling students”, “being able to attend remotely, so I didn’t have to take additional time off of my existing job”, “meeting with members of the firm before my interview.”

CALGARY ARTICLING 2024-2025 RECRUITMENT

- Respondents who applied to Calgary employers: **10 of 118 (8.5%)**
- Respondents selected for interviews with Calgary employers: **6 of 10 (60%)**
- Respondents who received and accepted job offers with Calgary employers: **3 of 6 (50%)**
- Respondents who experienced conduct contrary to the LSA Rules: **0 (0%)**

Awareness of Law Society of Alberta (LSA) Recruitment Rules

- Percentage of students aware of the existence of the LSA Recruitment Rules: **6 of 6 (100%)**
- Students learned about the existence of the **LSA Recruitment Rules** from:
 - Career Services/Development Office: **4 of 6**
 - Law Society of Alberta: **3 of 6**
 - Calgary employer: **2 of 6**

- Friend: **2 of 6**

Interview Process Format Preferences

Regardless of their interview experience, half (**3 of 6**) of respondents reported that they had no preference for what they would have liked to see included in the interview process. **2 of 6** respondents indicated that they preferred a mix of interviews and one-on-one interactions with employer representatives, and one respondent indicated that they preferred a mix of interviews and social events. None of the respondents chose “Interviews only”.

OTTAWA ARTICLING 2024-2025 RECRUITMENT

- Respondents who applied to Ottawa employers: **33 of 118 (28%)**
- Respondents selected for interviews with Ottawa employers: **25 of 33 (75.8%)**
- Respondents who received job offers with Ottawa employers: **16 of 25 (64%)**
- Respondents who accepted a job offer with an Ottawa employer: **15 of 16 (93.8%)**. Six respondents reported receiving multiple offers. Collectively, they indicated that “The people I met during interviews” (3 counts), “An intangible feeling” (3 counts), “Reputation, ranking or prestige” (2 counts), “Hire back rate” (2 counts), “Practice area strengths” (2 counts), “Salary” (2 counts), “Training opportunities” (1 count), “Culture” (1 count) and “Billable hour expectations” (1 count) most influenced their decision on which offer to accept.
- Respondents who experienced conduct contrary to the Ottawa recruitment protocol or other improper conduct: **1 of 24 (down from 2 respondents last round)**. One respondent indicated: “An employer asked me to advise as to the ranking of the employer or any other employer on my priority list”, “An employer asked about my intention to accept an offer of employment prior to the call day start time.” The respondent further clarified that “An employer heavily implied that I would get an offer and heavily implied they would like to know if I was their first choice.” Multiple times they said something like “I’m not going to ask, I’m not going to ask.” I didn’t say but they did make an offer.” There was also a report of “Other improper conduct not listed above” clarified as follows: “I was asked to take personal position on how law should be. It was very unethical and it made me very uncomfortable which made me withdraw from the process.”

Awareness of Ottawa Law Student Recruitment Ethics Protocol

- Percentage of students aware of the existence of the Ottawa Protocol: **48% (up by 4% since the last round of this survey)**
- Students learned about the existence of the Ottawa Protocol from:
 - Career Services/Development Office: **75% (up by 18%)**
 - Ottawa Employer: **25% (down by 4%)**
 - Other: **16.6%**

Social Events

- **64%** of respondents (**16 of 26**) reported not having been invited to employer-led social events. Of the eight who were, only one thought these were “insufficient”; the rest deemed the amount of time “appropriate.”
- One-on-one chats with an employer representative (**87.5%**) were deemed most useful in determining whether a candidate would accept an offer from the hosting employer. This was followed by interactions with a designated host (**50%**), and firm tours (**50%**). Receptions (**37.5%**) and dinners (**25%**) were reported least useful.
- Regardless of their interview experience, **10 of 24 respondents (41.7%)** would have liked to have seen only interviews included in the interview process. This was followed by “interviews and one-on-one interactions” (**29.2%**). Only 4 respondents indicated that they did not have a preference.

VANCOUVER 2024-2025 ARTICLING RECRUITMENT

- Respondents who applied to Vancouver employers: **23 of 118 (19.5%)**
- Respondents selected for interviews with Vancouver employers: **14 of 23 (60.9%)**
- Respondents who received job offers with Vancouver employers: **9 of 14 (64.3%)**
- Respondents who accepted a job offer with a Vancouver employer: **8 of 9 (88.9%)**. Half of respondents reported receiving multiple offers. Of those who did, the top factors that influenced their decision to accept the offer were “The people I met during interviews”, “Employer’s culture” and “Type of work available” (2 counts each), as well as “Reputation, ranking or prestige of employer”, “Salary”, “Benefits” and “Flexible work setting” (1 count each).
- Respondents who experienced conduct contrary to the VBA Guidelines or NALP Best Practices: **2 of 12 (16.7%)**. The two respondents reported that “An employer, either directly or indirectly, prior to the Offer Date, put pressure on me to accept an offer of employment or reveal my intention to do so” (2 counts), and “I was subject to other improper conduct not specified in the guideline (please specify: *“Asked about intention to accept, ranking, and available start date”*) (1 count).

Awareness of Vancouver Bar Association Guidelines

- Percentage of students aware of the existence of the VBA Guidelines: **100% (14 of 14)**
- Students learned about the existence of the VBA Guidelines from:
 - Career Services/Development Office: **57.1%**
 - Vancouver Bar Association: **42.9%**
 - Vancouver Employer: **35.7%**
 - Other: **7.1%** (“Google”)

Social Events

- Half of respondents (**50%**) were not invited to participate in any social events. Of the 7 respondents who were, 6 felt the amount of time dedicated to employer social events was appropriate, and only 1 believed it was insufficient.
- **All (100%)** of the respondents felt that one-on-one chats with a representative of the employer were useful in determining whether or not they would accept an offer from the hosting employer. Dinners (**4 of 7**) and firm tours (**3 of 7**) were also deemed useful.
- Regardless of their interview experience, respondents would have preferred to see interviews and one-on-one social interactions (**5 of 14**), as well as interviews and social events (**5 of 14**) included in the process. **3 of 14** would have preferred interviews only and a single respondent indicated not having a preference.

TORONTO 2024-2025 ARTICLING RECRUITMENT

- Respondents who applied to Toronto employers: **79 of 118 (66.9%)**
- Respondents selected for interviews with Toronto employers: **72 of 79 (91.1%)**
- Respondents who received a job offer with a Toronto employer: **53 of 72 (73.6%)**
- Respondents who accepted a job offer with a Toronto employer: **50 of 52 (96.2%)**. A notable **majority** of respondents (**31 of 51**) received more than one offer. Of the **61%** who received more than one offer, “Type of work” (**18 counts**), “People I met” (**16 counts**), “Reputation” (**11 counts**), “Culture” (**11 counts**) and “Salary” (**9 counts**) were the factors which most influenced their decision on which offer to accept.
- Respondents who experienced conduct contrary to the LSO Procedures/NALP Best Practices for Summer and Articling Recruitment: **19 of 66 (28.8%)**. This percentage is **down slightly from 31%** since the last round of this survey.

Awareness of Law Society of Ontario (LSO) Recruitment Procedures

- Percentage of students aware of the existence of the LSO Procedures: **70 of 71 (98.6%)**. This marks an **increase** on the result for the last round of this survey (**96%**).
- Students learned about the existence of the LSO Procedures from:
 - Career Services/Development Office: **83.1%**
 - Law Society of Ontario: **33.8%**
 - Toronto Employer: **18.3%**
 - Friend: **16.9%**
 - Other: **2.8%** (*“Internet job searching”, “My own research”*)
- **71.2%** of respondents reported that they did not experience conduct contrary to the LSO Recruitment Procedures. For those **28.8%** who did:

- “An employer attempted to solicit my intention to accept an offer, whether directly or indirectly, prior to the Offer Date” **(12 counts)**
 - “An employer advised me that the receipt of an offer was contingent on my indication that I would accept an offer if made” **(5 counts)**
 - “An employer communicated an intention to offer employment prior to the start time on Offer Day” **(3 counts)**
 - “An employer pressured me to spend excessive amounts of time with that employer to the exclusion of other employers” **(3 counts)**
 - “An employer asked me to rank them (or asked about my ranking of other employers)” **(3 counts)**
 - “An employer communicated with me during the cooling off period from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. on Offer Day;” **(2 counts)**
 - I was subject to other improper conduct not listed above (please specify) **(3 counts)** *“I had an employer cancel an interview at the time it was meant to start. He said he'd call and reschedule one with me but never followed up”, “A pre interview was taken by a surprise call during the blackout period for which I wasn't ready”, and “I was asked where else I was interviewing.”*
- In response to “Did you fail or opt not to adhere to any of the Best Practices?”, **100%** of respondents **(71 of 71)** indicated, “No”.

Social Events

- **32 of 72** respondents (**44.4%**) were not invited to participate in social events. Of those who were, most respondents (**34 of 40 or 85%**) felt the amount of time dedicated to employer social events was appropriate, while **4 of 40** reported it to be insufficient and **2 of 40** reported it to be excessive.
- Receptions were reported to be the most useful type of social event in determining whether or not a candidate would accept an offer from the hosting employer (**22 of 37 counts or 59.5%**, an **increase of nearly 20 percentage points** on the results from the last survey round). One-on-one chats with an employer representative were reported to be useful by **51.4%** of respondents, a **marked decrease** from the last survey round's **83%**.
- Regardless of their interview experience, respondents were split between preferring an interviews-only format (**33.3%**) and interviews mixed with one-on-one employer interactions (**26.4%**). **19.4%** would have appreciated interviews mixed with social events, and **20%** have no preference. These results are fairly consistent compared with the last survey round.

APPENDIX A: COMPLETE SURVEY QUESTIONS

2024-2025 Articling Recruitment: Rate Your Experience

This national survey is being conducted by the Canadian Section of NALP (National Association for Law Placement) in order to collect feedback from students on the structured recruitment processes in major urban centres across Canada. The survey below focuses on the recruitment processes for 2024-2025 articling positions in Calgary, Ottawa, Vancouver and Toronto.

Your completion of this survey is of critical importance. It will take approximately 10 minutes of your time. The survey is hosted on a secure website. The feedback you provide will be shared on an anonymous basis to inform recruitment best practices across Canada. Should an employer be referred to in the survey, a school side member of the NALP Recruitment Survey Working Group will provide the employer with the specific comments. Neither your name nor your school can be attributed to your comments by legal employers, as this information is not collected.

If you need to go back to a previous page while working on the survey, use the 'Back' button at the bottom of each page, NOT the back arrow in your browser. There is no need to click the 'Save' button unless you need to pause your work on the survey and return to it later. In this case click on the 'Save' button. This will save the answers you have entered so far and provide a link to complete the survey later. Be certain to make a note of this link so that you can use it later. It is not necessary to click on the 'Save' button to simply move through the survey.

We thank you in advance for taking the time to provide your anonymous feedback. If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, please contact your law school's Career Services/Development Office directly.

Please submit your survey by August 31st, 2023.

Part I. The question below relates to Equity, Diversity & Inclusion (ED&I).

Diversity, Equity & Inclusion are essential to the legal profession. In order to more accurately and consistently measure employers' success in recruiting excellence from a broad spectrum of individuals, we ask all respondents to consider answering this section.

For the purposes of this section, "equity-seeking groups" include the groups listed below as well as other groups of individuals who may face systemic barriers that impact their access to the legal profession.

1. Do you belong to or identify with any of the following equity-seeking groups:

- Indigenous Persons
- Racialized Persons or Visible Minorities
- LGBTQ2SA+
- Women

- People with disabilities (e.g. any impairment, including a physical, mental, intellectual, cognitive, learning, communication or sensory impairment, functional limitation that in interaction with a barrier may hinder your full and equal participation in society), whether permanent, temporary or episodic, evident or not)
 - People from an economically disadvantaged background
 - First-generation Students (first in your immediate family to attend university)
 - Student caregivers (dependents can include a minor child, aging parent or an adult with a disability)
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Other (please specify) _____

1. a) If yes, did you experience improper comments or questions during the recruitment process as it relates to any of the equity-seeking grounds listed?

- No
- Yes (We invite you to contact your Career Development Office to discuss it. Please note that you can also contact your jurisdiction's law society and/ or human rights commission.)

Please indicate the name(s) of the employer(s) and market(s); if you are comfortable, please include what the improper comments and/or questions were.

Part II. The question below asks about your job search.

2. What factors most influenced your decision about which employers to apply to for an articling position? (Check the three factors that were most important in your decision-making process.)

- Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion
- Employer's culture
- Employer's published hiring criteria
- Employer's hire back rate
- Employer's reputation on campus
- Office location (specific city or region)
- Input from family, friends, acquaintances, alumni or the Career Development Office
- Employer events and receptions
- Specific practice area strengths
- Salary/compensation
- Benefits, including parental leave
- Information about the employer found online (i.e. social media accounts, firm website, student forums, NALP's Canadian Directory of Legal Employers, etc.)
- Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)
- Employer's commitment to pro bono
- Training opportunities
- Other (please specify) _____

Part III. The questions below ask about your experience with the interview process.

The following questions are specific to the Calgary 2024-2025 articling recruitment process.

3. Did you apply to any Calgary employers for 2024-2025 articling positions for which interviews were held in June 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 4)

3a. Were you selected for interviews with any Calgary employers in June 2023 for 2024-25 articles?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 4)

3b. During the interview period, was the amount of time dedicated to social events organized by the employer, including virtual or in-person one-on-one chats, firm tours, receptions and dinners:

- Insufficient
- Appropriate
- Excessive
- I was not invited to participate in any social events (survey will skip to question 3d)

3c. In general, which types of social events were useful in determining whether or not you would like to accept an offer from the hosting employer? (Check all that apply.)

- One-on-one chats with a representative of the employer
- Interactions with your designated "buddy" or "host", if you were assigned one by the employer
- Firm tour
- Reception
- Dinner

3d. Regardless of your experience during the in-office interview period, what would you have liked to see included in the interview process?

- Interviews only
- Interviews and one-on-one social interactions with representatives of the employer
- Interviews and social events
- I have no preference

3e. Were you offered an articling position with a Calgary employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 3h)

3f. Did you accept an articling position with a Calgary employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes

- No (survey will skip to question 3h)

3g. If you received multiple offers, what most influenced your decision on which offer to accept? (Check the three factors that were most important in your decision-making process.)

- The people I met during interviews
- Training opportunities
- Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion
- An intangible feeling
- Reputation, ranking, or prestige of employer
- Employer's commitment to pro bono
- Employer's culture
- Employer's hire back rate
- Employer's reputation on campus
- Type of work available / specific practice area strengths
- Billable hours expectations
- Office location (specific city or region)
- Salary/compensation
- Benefits, including parental leave
- Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)
- I did not receive multiple offers
- Other (please specify) _____

3h. Were you aware that the Law Society of Alberta (LSA) has recruitment rules that regulate recruitment for articling student hiring in Calgary and Alberta?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 3j.)

3i. How did you learn about the existence of the LSA Recruitment Rules?

- Career Services/Development Office
- Law Society of Alberta
- Calgary Employer
- Friend
- Other (please specify) _____

3j. Which, if any, of the conducts listed below and deemed improper by the LSA, or other improper employer conduct, did you experience during interviews?

- An employer communicated an offer of employment or an intention to offer employment prior to 8AM MST on offer day
- An offer remained open for less than 24 hours
- I was subject to other improper conduct not listed above (please specify) _____
- I was not subject to any improper conduct during in-office interviews

Note that you will have an opportunity later in this survey to provide comments about any positive or improper conduct of specific employers and/or individuals during the interview period, which you directly experienced.

The following questions are specific to the Ottawa 2024-2025 articling

recruitment process.

4. Did you apply to any Ottawa employers for 2024-2025 articling positions for which interviews were held in summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5)

4a. Were you selected for interviews with any Ottawa employers in Summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5)

4b. During the interview period, was the amount of time dedicated to social events organized by the employer, including virtual or in-person or one-on-one chats, firm tours, receptions and dinners:

- Insufficient
- Appropriate
- Excessive
- I was not invited to participate in any social events (survey will skip to question 5d)

4c. In general, which types of social events were useful in determining whether or not you would like to accept an offer from the hosting employer? (Check all that apply.)

- One-on-one chats with a representative of the employer
- Interactions with your designated "buddy" or "host", if you were assigned one by the employer
- Firm tour
- Reception
- Dinner

4d. Regardless of your experience during the interview period, what would you have liked to see included in the interview process?

- Interviews only
- Interviews and one-on-one social interactions with representatives of the employer
- Interviews and social events
- I have no preference

4e. Were you offered an articling position with an Ottawa employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5h)

4f. Did you accept an articling position with an Ottawa employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5h)

4g. If you received multiple offers, what most influenced your decision on which

offer to accept? (Check the three factors that were most important in your decision-making process.)

- The people I met during interviews
- Training opportunities
- Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion
- An intangible feeling
- Reputation, ranking, or prestige of employer
- Employer's commitment to pro bono
- Employer's culture
- Employer's hire back rate
- Employer's reputation on campus
- Type of work available / specific practice area strengths
- Billable hours expectations
- Office location (specific city or region)
- Salary/compensation
- Benefits, including parental leave
- Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)
- I did not receive multiple offers
- Other (please specify) _____

4h. Were you aware that Ottawa employers have established voluntary guidelines (the Ottawa Law Student Recruitment Ethics Protocol) which regulate recruitment for articling positions in Ottawa?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5j.)

4i. How did you learn about the existence of these guidelines?

- Career Services/Development Office
- Ottawa employer
- Friend
- Other (please specify) _____

4j. Which, if any, of the conducts listed below and deemed improper by the Ethics Protocol, or other improper employer conduct, did you experience during interviews?

- An employer communicated an intention to offer employment prior to the call day start time;
 - An employer asked me to advise as to the ranking of the employer or any other employer on my priority list;
 - An employer asked about my intention to accept an offer of employment prior to the call day start time;
 - An employer advised me that receipt of an offer was contingent on me indicating that the employer was my number one top ranked choice in advance of call day;
 - I was subject to other improper conduct not listed above (please specify);
-
- I was not subject to any improper conduct during in-office interviews;

Note that you will have an opportunity later in this survey to provide comments about any positive or improper conduct of specific employers and/or individuals during the interview period, which you directly experienced.

The following questions are specific to the Vancouver 2024-2025 articling recruitment process.

5. Did you apply to any Vancouver employers for 2024-2025 articling positions for which interviews were held in summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 6)

5a. Were you selected for interviews with any Vancouver employers in Summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 6)

5b. During the interview period, was the amount of time dedicated to social events, virtual or in person, organized by the employer, including one-on-one chats, firm tours, receptions and dinners:

- Insufficient
- Appropriate
- Excessive
- I was not invited to participate in any social events (survey will skip to question 5d)

5c. In general, which types of social events were useful in determining whether or not you would like to accept an offer from the hosting employer? (Check all that apply.)

- One-on-one chats with a representative of the employer
- Interactions with your designated "buddy" or "host", if you were assigned one by the employer
- Firm tour
- Reception
- Dinner

5d. Regardless of your experience during the interview period, what would you have liked to see included in the interview process?

- Interviews only
- Interviews and one-on-one social interactions with representatives of the employer
- Interviews and social events
- I have no preference

5e. Were you offered an articling position with a Vancouver employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes

- No (survey will skip to question 5h)

5f. Did you accept an articling position with a Vancouver employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5h)

5g. If you received multiple offers, what most influenced your decision on which offer to accept? (Check the three factors that were most important in your decision-making process.)

- The people I met during interviews
- Training opportunities
- Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion
- An intangible feeling
- Reputation, ranking, or prestige of employer
- Employer's commitment to pro bono
- Employer's culture
- Employer's hire back rate
- Employer's reputation on campus
- Type of work available / specific practice area strengths
- Billable hours expectations
- Office location (specific city or region)
- Salary/compensation
- Benefits, including parental leave
- Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)
- I did not receive multiple offers
- Other (please specify) _____

5h. Were you aware that the Vancouver Bar Association (VBA) has voluntary guidelines which regulate the recruitment of summer and articling positions in downtown Vancouver, including both the VBA's Articling Interview Guidelines (the "Guidelines") and the NALP Best Practices for Vancouver Summer and Articling Recruitment Activities (the "Best Practices")?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 5j.)

5i. How did you learn about the existence of these voluntary Guidelines and Best Practices?

- Career Services/Development Office
- Vancouver Bar Association
- Vancouver employer
- Friend
- Other (please specify) _____

5j. Which, if any, of the conducts listed below and deemed improper by the voluntary Guidelines or the Best Practices, or other improper employer conduct, did you experience during interviews?

- An offer was made prior to 8:00 am on the Thursday of Interview Week

- An employer, either directly or indirectly, prior to the Offer Date, put pressure on me to accept an offer of employment or reveal my intention to do so.
- An employer pressured me to spend excessive amounts of time with that employer to the exclusion of other employers
- I was subject to other improper conduct (please specify) _____
- I was not subject to any improper conduct during in-firm interview(s) or Interview Week

Note that you will have an opportunity later in this survey to provide comments about any positive or improper conduct of specific employers and/or individuals during the interview period, which you directly experienced.

The following questions are specific to the Toronto 2024-2025 articling recruitment process.

6. Did you apply to any Toronto employers for 2024-2025 articling positions for which interviews were held in summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to the next section of the survey)

6a. Were you selected for interviews with any Toronto employers in Summer 2023?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to the next section of the survey)

6b. During the interview period, was the amount of time dedicated to social events, virtual or in person, organized by the employer, including one-on-one chats, firm tours, receptions and dinners:

- Insufficient
- Appropriate
- Excessive
- I was not invited to participate in any social events (survey will skip to question 6d)

6c. In general, which types of social events were useful in determining whether or not you would like to accept an offer from the hosting employer? (Check all that apply.)

- One-on-one chats with a representative of the employer
- Interactions with your designated "buddy" or "host", if you were assigned one by the employer
- Firm tour
- Reception
- Dinner

6d. Regardless of your experience during the interview period, what would you have liked to see included in the interview process?

- Interviews only
- Interviews and one-on-one social interactions with representatives of the employer
- Interviews and social events

I have no preference

6e. Were you offered an articling position with a Toronto employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 6h.)

6f. Did you accept an articling position with a Toronto employer through this recruitment process?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 6h.)

6g. If you received multiple offers, what most influenced your decision on which offer to accept? (Check the three factors that were most important in your decision-making process.)

- The people I met during interviews
- Training opportunities
- Employer's commitment to diversity and inclusion
- An intangible feeling
- Reputation, ranking, or prestige of employer
- Employer's commitment to pro bono
- Employer's culture
- Employer's hire back rate
- Employer's reputation on campus
- Type of work available / specific practice area strengths
- Billable hours expectations
- Office location (specific city or region)
- Salary/compensation
- Benefits, including parental leave
- Flexible work setting (e.g., option to work remotely or hybrid)
- I did not receive multiple offers
- Other (please specify) _____

6h. Were you aware that the Law Society of Ontario (LSO) has Recruitment Procedures that regulate recruitment for summer and articling positions in the City of Toronto?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to question 6j.)

6i. How did you learn about the existence of the LSO Recruitment Procedures?

- Career Services/Development Office
- Toronto Employer
- Law Society of Ontario
- Friend
- Other (please specify) _____

6j. Which, if any, of the conduct listed below and deemed improper by the NALP

Best Practices, or other improper employer conduct, did you experience during interviews?

- An employer communicated an intention to offer employment prior to 5:00 p.m. on Offer Day;
- An employer attempted to solicit my intention to accept an offer, whether directly or indirectly, prior to the Offer Date;
- An employer advised me that the receipt of an offer was contingent on my indication that I would accept an offer if made;
- An employer asked me to rank them (or asked about my ranking of other employers on my priority list);
- An employer pressured me to spend excessive amounts of time with that employer to the exclusion of other employers;
- An employer advised or encouraged me to cancel scheduled interviews with other employers;
- An employer communicated with me during the cooling off period from 3:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. on Offer Day;
- I was subject to other improper conduct not listed above (please specify)

I was not subject to any improper conduct during in-firm interview(s)

Note that you will have an opportunity later in this survey to provide comments about any positive or improper conduct of specific employers and/or individuals during the interview period, which you directly experienced.

6k. The NALP Best Practices for Summer and Articling Recruitment provides that "in fairness to all those involved in the recruitment process, and in accordance with the Recruitment Procedures and Best Practices, students should:

- a. Notify the employer immediately if unable to attend a scheduled interview;
- b. Promptly decline or cancel any offers for interviews which are no longer being seriously considered;
- c. Immediately release all outstanding offers as soon as one has been accepted;
- d. Honour any commitment made to an employer regardless of any additional offers that are subsequently received; and
- e. Not falsely represent an intention to accept an employer's offer."

Did you fail or opt not to adhere to any of the Best Practices?

- Yes (if 'Yes' please complete the item immediately below)
- No

Please explain your reason for so doing (e.g. did you perceive such conduct as necessary to your participation in the process?).

7. How would you rate your level of stress during the recruitment process?
[1 to 5 rating, where 1 is none and 5 is extremely high.]

- 1 (None)
- 2

- 3
- 4
- 5 (Extremely high)

7a. Regardless of your experience during the recruitment process, what type of information, if any, would have eased your stress ahead of interviews?

- Information about student outcomes in previous years
- Information about the format of the interview(s) (e.g., length, number of interviewers, platform used)
- Information about the type(s) of questions asked during the interview(s) (e.g., behavioral)
- Name(s) of interviewers
- Intention to call emails ahead of interview offers
- Other (Please specify): _____
- None of the above

7b. What resources, if any, provided by your law school did you find helpful in managing your stress during the recruitment process?

- Information sessions
- One-on-one career advising
- Interview preparation
- Review of application materials
- Mentorship program
- Wellness advisors / mental health counselling
- Other (Please specify): _____
- I did not use any resources provided by my law school

7c. What initiatives, if any, offered by employers did you find helpful in managing your stress during the recruitment process?

- Clear, detailed and up-to-date information on the employer's website
- Detailed job posting including information about salary/compensation
- Flexibility with interview scheduling
- Timely notice when my candidacy is no longer being considered
- Pre-recruitment support (e.g. mock interviews, cv review)
- Informational interviews
- Open Houses
- Other (Please specify): _____
- I did not take advantage of any of the initiatives offered by employers.

8. Please use the items below to describe specific actions of employers which ran counter to the recruiting guidelines for the market in which it occurred, or to note an experience with an employer that you especially appreciated.

Select a market/recruitment, indicate the name of the employer, the kind of comment, and then complete your comment. If you wish to make a comment on another employer, click on 'Yes' where asked and a new page will be available. When you choose 'No', you will be taken to the end of the survey.

8a. Select the market/recruitment to which your comment applies.

- 1. Calgary Articling Recruitment
- 2. Ottawa Articling Recruitment
- 3. Toronto Articling Recruitment
- 4. Vancouver Articling Recruitment

8b. Indicate the name of the employer (name of firm or organization):

8c. Select the kind of comment you wish to make.

- Conduct contrary to recruiting guidelines
- Other improper conduct/Experience that you did not appreciate
- Experience or interaction with this employer that you appreciated

8d. Your comment about this employer

Comment on another employer?

- Yes
- No (survey will skip to the end)

End of survey.