

SAFAGRAM

President's Message

By Doug Spurgeon



A lot has happened so far in 2010.

By mid-March, we had 7 position abolishments--2 welders, 3 plumbers, and 2 electricians. The reasons have all been the same: low apprentice enrolment and reduced funding from the Government arm for apprentices in the upcoming year. If you are a frequent reader of the WEAL, you would have noticed in the past couple of issues interviews with Wayne King, VP Capital and Corporate Services and CFO. In these interviews, he has

said that there are currently no plans for "layoffs." Technically he is correct since a layoff is the result of an unexpected work shortage with the expectation that the affected member will return to gainful employment once the work increases again. An abolishment means that a staffing redundancy has been identified, and as such one or more positions would have to be removed because the current student load and class contact hours are less than the total positions that are currently allocated. In other words, there are too many people for the teaching loads and other related duties. Will there be more faculty position abolishments? The answer to that lies in how student enrolment in all areas of Grant Funded programs progresses. My hope would be that no more would be coming, but I cannot say that with a guarantee.

Some faculty have asked that if we have low student numbers, could other types of work; e.g., corporate training, be used to retain currently employed staff. Currently in the Collective Agreement, there is a provision for this reassignment, but it is not mandated that SAIT must take this approach. To do this type of work is deemed as "fee-for-service," and full-time faculty "may" use that work as part of their load. As well, there is a provision that continuing education courses "can" be used but only with "mutual agreement." There is nothing within the agreement that forces SAIT to make these types of changes.

Recently an e-mail sent to faculty from me brought forward two important issues: "designation" and "freedom of association." (A copy of this e-mail is included at the bottom of this message.)

Continued on page 2

In this Issue

President's Message	Page 1
Library Report	Page 4
AFA/ACIFA Survey Results for 2009	Page 4
A Chance for Progress	Page 5
SAFA 2008/09 Annual Faculty Opinion Survey Results	Page 6
2009 ACIFA Climate Survey Results	Page 16
ACIFA 2009 Climate Survey Results Summary	Page 21

Editorial Board

Pat Squibb
Wendy Strashok
BJ Hamilton—Cartoonist

Layout

Luda Paul

Printed by

Students of the Digital Graphics
Communications (DGC) Program

SAFAGRAM is published by the SAIT Academic Faculty Association (SAFA) five times a year usually closer to the end of the months of October, December, February, April, and June. Deadline for submissions is the 10th of the month preceding publication. Send submissions to SAFAGRAM, care of the SAFA office, N201 or e-mail submissions to luda.paul@sait.ca. Please keep submissions under 300 words, double-spaced. Submissions may be edited for grammar, length, or content.

SAFAGRAM editorial policy, as approved by the SAFA Executive on June 14, 1995, is as follows:

1. The Editorial Board has the final say as to what is included or deleted from the newsletter.
2. Editorial Board decisions about newsletter material must be agreed to by consensus.
3. The newsletter will include a disclaimer stating that the views expressed in its content do not necessarily represent the views of the Editorial Board or SAFA.
4. All material included in the newsletter must
 - be signed by the author when submitted to the editors, but anonymity may be requested and granted for printing.
 - be based on "reasoned argument" if personal criticism is used.
 - not involve name-calling.
 - not include sexist, racist, or homophobic comments.
 - be related to SAIT, although this will be interpreted broadly.

The views expressed in SAFAGRAM do not necessarily represent the views of the Editorial Board or SAFA.

The designation concern arises from the powers that the Alberta Government has bestowed upon the Board of Governors (BOG). Specifically under Section 60(2) of the Post Secondary Learning Act (PSLA), the BOG has the ability to designate who is and who is not an Academic Staff Member. Those who work under "fee-for-service" are designated as Non-Academic Staff Members. The Association has taken the stance that this is contrary to Freedom of Association as granted under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, specifically Subsection 2(d) freedom of association.

Some faculty have questioned the charter challenge and suggested that we discuss this with SAIT Management. The fact remains that under the current PSLA, SAIT is not doing anything wrong or illegal. They have the right to say who is in and who is not in the Faculty Association. SAIT cannot change this fact by themselves but can work with SAFA on the designation issue. Presently fee-for-service workers seem to be a benefit to the SAIT organization. The Collective Agreement does not protect fee-for-service instructors, and they are not bound to any work restrictions that we as Academic Staff are. SAIT alone cannot change legislation. This is why the challenge must go through the Court system. This will be a long process. Faculty Council has approved with a vote of 15 for and 3 against to move \$100,000 from cash surplus to a fund for the charter challenge. This does not mean that a dues increase will be coming. As was relayed to all in November 16 (e-mail attached to this message), the current funding from SAFA will be confined to the surplus. Currently talks are underway with ACIFA member institutes for further financial backing. Conceptually backing has been obtained. At this same Faculty Council meeting, it was moved that a Letter of Intent be sent to Irene Lewis, President and CEO of SAIT, prior to filing. This letter outlining the Association's position was sent on March 5, 2010, and was filed on March 22, 2010.

An interpretation may be that perhaps the legislators have overstepped the PSLA by forming the Association. If that is the case, then filing for Certification should be our next step. Therefore, we would have the ability either to certify as an Association as we currently are or to join an existing certified body (Union/Association). The question has also come up--what if the members at large do

not want to certify but would rather negotiate their contracts individually? That is a possibility that could result if the Association as it stands now was dissolved by the Legislature, and the members voted by majority not to form a union or association. This, however, would be exactly what we are fighting for, freedom of association and the right to make a democratic choice. From our perspective a certified association would be the most effective tool to continue advocating for the collective rights of all faculty.

E-mail attachment:

From: Doug Spurgeon
Sent: 16-Nov-09 9:13 AM
To: Faculty
Subject: post secondary learning act (PSLA)

One of the challenges that we face as Faculty at this institution is a dwindling membership.

The use of Fee-For-Service instructors is prevalent at SAIT. For the most part these Fee-For-Service instructors are confined to non-grant funded work.

There currently is a verbal agreement between SAFA and SAIT that those members designated as Academic Staff are the Faculty that teach within "grant funded courses"; diploma and apprentice.

SAFA has and continues to take the stance that instruction on campus should rightfully be done by Academic Staff as designated by the Post Secondary Act (PSLA).

Recently through the Alberta Colleges and Technical Institutes Association (ACIFA) in conjunction with the Confederation of Alberta Faculty Associations (CAFA) a proposal for changes to the PSLA was brought forward to the Alberta Government.

The changes requested related to

1. designation and de-designation decisions
2. procedures respecting the negotiation of future agreements
3. powers and rights and interest arbitrations
4. resolution of disputes relating to unfair labour practices
5. protection of academic staff members in the event of transfer of employment

All requested changes have been rejected by the government.

SAFA has pushed for several years over the "designation" of "Academic Staff". The PSLA grants the Board of Governors (BOG) the right to specify who is or who is not a member of "Academic Staff" in effect the BOG have the ability to state who is in and who is not covered by any collective agreement that may be in force. This is actually contradictory to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in regards to the freedom of association.

Given the recent decision of the Alberta Government in the rejection of the proposed changes this has now left SAFA and the member colleges of ACIFA with limited choices for dealing with the "designation" issue. One choice is to try and resolve at bargaining; while it may be the preferred choice, due to the current language in the PSLA changes are very slim in making that a realization.

The other choice that comes about is to bring forward a Charter Challenge on the PSLA. At the next ACIFA Presidents meeting in February this will be one of the topics brought to the table. SAFA has pushed for support in a challenge to the designation right under the PSLA. Currently all member Colleges of ACIFA have unanimously moved an "expression

of support" towards SAFA in this situation.

The effects of a charter challenge will mean that SAFA will be committing to a multi year endeavour in which to have the courts rule on the validity of the "designation" under the PSLA. Of course this will come at a cost. Currently any such challenge; if we were to go alone; would come from reserves of the Association and no dues increase would be forthcoming. SAFA in conjunction with ACIFA are putting forward to the other member Colleges requests to support the challenge as other member Colleges are also starting to feel the squeeze of "designation" within their ranks. SAFA and ACIFA will also be approaching CAFA and CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers); which ACIFA is an associated member; for both legal and financial support in this challenge.

The right of designation is an issue that can not be ignored. This issue needs to be brought forward in order to save jobs.


Just because an instructor teaches con-ed/corporate training during the day; which is "non-granted funded"; this should not mean that they should not receive the protection and benefits as negotiated for those that do work inside of "grant-funded programs". SAFA continues to consult with those instructors that work under the "fee-for-service" banner when issue(s) do arise. However when discrepancies occur in which they would be offered rights under the Collective Agreement these individuals find themselves without proper representation and are at the whims of the employer of the day. How "fee-for-service" is used is also incorporated into grievances that the Association currently have open. If enrolment numbers are down in the "grant-funded" side of the College, why can not some of the con-ed/corporate training programs be used to maintain Faculty jobs; as agreed to in the "Continuing Education and/or Corporate Training Letter of Understanding". The answer to this comes from point 1 of the letter in which it states "can be used" but not "must" be used. This is a loophole in which abolishment's are justified as not rightfully the work of Faculty.

SAFA currently has around 700 members. Compare this with NAIT, in which approximately 1200 members belong to NASA (NAIT Academic Staff Association) in which we teach approximately the same number of courses, an immediate question comes to mind. Why the difference in Designated Faculty?

SAFA is interested in your feedback, both positive and negative, on this issue. Please do not hesitate to contact the SAFA office for any questions that may arise form (sic) either reading or discussions with peers.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.
Doug Spurgeon
SAFA President

Oxymorons

- 
- Is it good if a vacuum really sucks?
 - Why is the third hand on the watch called the second hand?
 - If a word is misspelled in the dictionary, how would we ever know?
 - If Webster wrote the first dictionary, where did he find the words?
 - Why do we say something is out of whack? What is a whack?
 - Why does "slow down" and "slow up" mean the same thing?
 - Why does "fat chance" and "slim chance" mean the same thing?
 - Why do "tug" boats push their barges?
 - Why do we sing "Take me out to the ball game" when we're already there?
 - Why are they called "stands" when they are made for sitting?
 - Why is it called "after dark" when it really is "after light"?
 - Doesn't "expecting the unexpected" make the unexpected expected?
 - Why are a "wise man" and a "wise guy" opposites?
 - Why do "overlook" and "oversee" mean opposite things?
 - Why is "phonics" not spelled the way it sounds?
 - If work is so terrific, why do they have to pay you to do it?
 - If all the world is a stage, where is the audience sitting?
 - If love is blind, why is lingerie so popular?
 - If you are cross-eyed and have dyslexia, can you read all right?
 - Why is bra singular and panties plural?
 - Why do you press harder on the buttons of a remote control when you know the batteries are dead?
 - Why do we put suits in garment bags and garments in a suitcase?
 - How come abbreviated is such a long word?
 - Why do we wash bath towels? Aren't we clean when we use them?
 - Why doesn't glue stick to the inside of the bottle?
 - Why do they call it a TV set when you only have one?
 - Christmas - What other time of the year do you sit in front of a dead tree and eat candy out of your socks?
 - Why do we drive on a parkway and park on a driveway?
 - I dunno, why do we?

Library Report



By David Luinstra
Coordinator of Instruction and
Communications

⇒ Films On Demand

The SAIT Library has acquired a new fantastic resource called Films On Demand that provides home and classroom access to many licensed videos in the following broad subject areas:

- Business and Economics
- Health and Medicine
- Technical Education

Films On Demand uses leading-edge technology to create a video-streaming platform that makes it possible for instructors to incorporate educational videos into lesson plans and learning courseware. Instructors and students can create playlists for classroom presentations as well as their own personal-user accounts to store their favorite video clips.

There are videos with information about everything from “automotive and auto body repairs” to “zooming and framing camera techniques.” New and best selling videos are always being digitized, segmented, and routinely added to this collection.

The Films On Demand collection is licensed for SAIT classroom use. Off-campus use requires a SAIT ID and Library PIN.

The SAIT Library is very proud to present this remarkable new video product to further assist our faculty and students with their academic goals. For more informa-

tion about Films On Demand, please contact AnneMarie DeGroot, Library System Administrator and AV Services Coordinator at (403) 284-8431 or by e-mail at library.av@sait.ca.

⇒ SAIT Library Seen Digitally

SAIT recently adopted Digital Signage to publicize the campus’s institutional and academic announcements. Twenty-five large plasma screens are currently stationed in high-traffic areas all over the main campus and satellite campuses. The SAIT Library has embraced this new medium to showcase what we do best and to reach out to our clientele.

Every day, we answer many questions for students and faculty at the Library Information Desk. Frequently asked questions like the ones listed below are easily answered with the aid of our digital signage monitor:

- When is the Library open?
- How can I use electronic resources from home?
- Is the Library wireless?
- Do you have group study rooms?

Digital signage has provided us with another opportunity to promote the Library’s services, resources, and facilities to the main campus and its satellites. During the summer of 2009, Alison Hart and Danica Dixon created messages and selected images. In September, the messages were launched on SAITVIEW with tremendous work and support from Jorge Palafox, SAIT’s Digital Signage Coordinator. The promotional possibilities of digital signage will continue to evolve as our library moves forward.

⇒ Library Survey

The 2010 Library Survey wrapped up in March and it was a tremendous success. Over 1500 hundred students completed the survey and three lucky respondents will receive a Nintendo Wii, a Canon Digital, or an iPod Nano. The annual survey helps us improve and enhance library service, and we thank everybody who took the time to provide us with their feedback. ♦

SAFA/ACIFA Survey Results for 2009



By Doug Spurgeon

Included with this SAFAGRAM are the 2009 SAFA/ACIFA survey results.

In order to make the SAFA Survey more readable

- 5 and 4 responses are combined into one number
- 2 and 1 responses are combined into one number
- 5/4 number is on the side of the very well/good to simply well/good.
- 2/1 is on the opposite side of the scale
- 3 has been left as is, since it sits in the middle of the road.

As you look at the results, you will see both blue and red numbers. These are the total numbers as described above. The number is blue to show a positive change and red to show a negative change. On the few occasions that you see both, this appears to be a polarization of faculty. To be a positive change (blue) that means the very well to well score has increased or the other end of the scale has decreased. If you see a nega-

tive change (red), it is simply a reverse of what was previously mentioned.

With the ACIFA survey, I have tallied the percentages in a similar manner as done with the SAFA survey. The intent of this is to show at a quicker glance where things have changed according to the surveys from last year. The Provincial table shows the comparison with our counterparts within ACIFA. Just using a basic average of all the numbers provided, SAIT has moved from 13th position to 11th of the 15 member institutes. Although it may appear that the ratings of the other institutes just went down, it should be noted that the ratings for SAIT remained either constant or improved. This shows that at least according to the survey we are heading in the right direction.

The results from these surveys have been discussed with SAIT Senior Executive, and a copy has been given to them. Discussions included how to get more people to complete the survey

Continued on page 5

A Chance for Progress

By Sean O'Flynn



Faculty negotiations have begun all over Alberta College campuses and have just finished in Ontario. In Ontario, the Ontario Public Service Employees Union

(OPSEU) provincially represents all College faculty members, a number totalling 9,000. Negotiations were tough, and the Union's bargaining team felt bullied into presenting the employer's offer to faculty for a ratification vote. Despite the Union advising members to vote against the proposal, the vote was 51.25 percent in favour of accepting the employer's offer. This agreement included a retroactive salary increase of 1.75 percent as of September 2009, a 2.00 percent increase in September 2010, and a 2.00 percent increase in September 2011. However, the agreement also weakened the workload formula currently used to determine an instructor's workload. This collective agreement also left many unresolved workplace issues, which will make for difficulties in the future. In the end, this contract may ultimately lead to future labour disruption and a decrease

in the quality of instruction provided to the students.

We need to learn from the mistakes of our Ontario colleagues and work to improve the quality of education on our campus. While Ontario Colleges may have coerced their faculty into signing a new contract, the long-term consequences of this move may ultimately lead to students' choosing other post-secondary options that offer a higher degree of quality. SAIT is already competing for students in many of their programs, and anything that may decrease the quality of instruction will simply hinder their ability to attract students and government funding. SAIT is able to attract students because instructors provide real, practical knowledge. Our students receive credentials that signal employers of a high standard of education. If employers and future students no longer believe that SAIT credentials represent a quality education, then all the marketing, corporate communications, and management in the world will not be enough to get students to enroll.

Therefore, it is important for SAIT to become a leader of post-secondary

education in Canada, a goal that starts with creating an effective collective agreement for front-line Faculty and Staff. So far negotiations have started positively, although we have not begun to discuss any financial issues at this point. We have been able to have some intelligent, thoughtful discussions that will hopefully lead to improvements in your working conditions and contribute to a more effective, efficient organizational structure. It is hoped that this positive momentum will also lead to an improvement in the overall SAIT-SAFA relationship, which will in turn result in students receiving a higher standard of education. While there has been some recent improvement in management's willingness to solve problems, there is still a lot of work that must be done. SAFA is making a good faith attempt in bargaining, and outside of bargaining, to improve this relationship. While there appears to be some reciprocation by management to work on improving this relationship, only time will tell whether this is just an anomaly or rather represents the start of real long-term progress in the SAIT-SAFA relationship. ♦

ACIFA Survey Results
continued from page 4

and how to get people to recognize that input from the survey is looked at and remedies are sought. This last part may take longer to achieve. Not all changes can happen overnight nor can everyone see all changes. If these results are an indication of moving in the right direction, then results and changes from the 2008 survey must have been noticed at least by some faculty.

It would be better if more faculty identify the school/department they are with since having those results will better define current climate and perception at the time. Everyone must keep in mind that the surveys capture a specific moment in time and mirror the perceptions of the day. Those who do not wish to identify which area they are currently working in could also indicate a certain perception, which I hope is not the case of mistrust or fear. As well, in departments that have few numbers, those responses are not included inside a specific identified department. Only by getting a bigger response from each school/

department can we truly identify areas of concern that are in need of attention as the majority of members from that area use the survey as a tool to voice their concerns.

If you feel the results do not accurately show what you believe to be the actual picture in your area, please remember how important it is for each faculty member to complete the survey in the future. This is the only way we can assure accurate results that we (SAFA and Management) can work with.

For any members who would like to comment on the results, please communicate your thoughts to the SAFA office. As in all surveys, a lot can be read into or out of the statistically compiled results. I will leave you to draw your own conclusions of the results presented to you. ♦

Dave Barry's 50 Years of Experience

- Never, under any circumstances, combine a sleeping pill and a laxative on the same night.
- If you had to specify, in one word, why the human race has not, and will never achieve its full potential, that word would be meetings.
- It is a fine line between "hobby" and "mental illness."
- People who push to share their religious views with you rarely care to have you to share yours with them.
- One does well to separate one's career from one's life.
- Nobody cares if you can't dance. Just dance.
- Regardless of the temptation, don't lick a steak knife.
- The most devastating force in the world is gossip.
- You should never say anything to a woman that even hints that you think she's pregnant.

SAFA 2008/09 ANNUAL FACULTY OPINION SURVEY RESULTS

Faculty Response: 2009—252, 2008—217, 2007—283

QUESTION		5	4	3	2	1	0
		PERCENTAGE RESPONSE 09/ 08 / 07					
<i>Mission</i>		5	4	3	2	1	0
1. How well does SAIT live up to its Mission, "SAIT shall be an innovative organization equipping people to compete successfully in the changing world of work by providing relevant, skill-oriented education"? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	8 43 51 15 55	35 42 40	38 36 35	12 7 6	6 18 6 13 3 9	1 1
<i>Values</i>							
2. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of customer service: "We will be customer driven and earn the satisfaction of our learners and their employers by being responsive, by increasing accessibility and by being priced competitively."? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	3 29 4 33 10 41	26 29 31	39 38 38	19 14 14	11 30 9 23 7 21	2 6
3. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of people: "We value the cooperation, innovation, diversity and integrity of each individual."? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	8 33 9 33 10 36	25 24 26	28 29 28	20 21 20	20 40 17 38 16 36	1 1
4. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of quality: "We continually strive for excellence in our programs, services and environment."? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	7 36 5 31 9 38	29 26 29	34 37 37	20 19 17	10 30 13 32 8 25	1 0
5. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of communication: "We value constructive, open, accurate communication, enhancing teamwork and the exchange of ideas."? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	7 33 5 27 10 31	26 22 21	26 30 28	18 22 21	22 40 21 41 20 41	1 1
6. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of accountability: "We are accountable to our customers and our funders, to responsibly, effectively and efficiently provide high quality programs and services (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	6 30 4 31 7 33	24 27 26	36 38 43	17 15 15	13 30 11 26 9 24	5 6
7. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of environment: "We demonstrate leadership in the areas of environmental protection, conservation and safety." (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	6 27 4 26 10 40	21 22 30	34 36 38	16 16 13	12 28 10 26 8 21	12 12
8. How do you think SAIT has lived up to its value of commitment: "We are committed to continuous progress, to quality and to the communities we serve." (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07 '08 '09	6 33 4 36 10 42	27 32 32	40 38 41	14 14 11	9 23 10 24 6 17	4 3

<i>Senior Management</i>			5	4	3	2	1	0
9. <i>SAIT's Vice-President, Academic provides effective leadership in the academic and instructional services area. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	8	24	26	18	15	8	
	'08	32	29	21	12	33	17	
	'09	5 34 8 41	33	27	15	16 28 18 33		
10. <i>The Vice-President, External Relations provides effective leadership in communications and fund raising. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	2	16	25	9	6	41	
	'08	18	22	18	6	15	44	
	'09	4 26 8 50	42	35	11	6 12 5 16		
11. <i>The Vice-President, Finance & CFO provides effective leadership in the areas of administration and finance (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	2	14	23	12	4	46	
	'08	16	14	22	5	16	50	
	'09	3 17 6 33	27	45	15	6 11 7 22		
12. <i>The Vice-President, Employee & Student Services, provides effective leadership in the area of employee and student services. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	1	15	24	13	11	36	
	'08	16	15	25	11	24	36	
	'09	3 18 7 33	26	33	21	10 21 13 34		
13. <i>SAIT's Senior Management fosters and encourages open, honest communication within departments. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neutral (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	7	25	21	19	20	8	
	'08	32	24	19	23	39	10	
	'09	5 29 7 30	23	23	20	19 42 28 48		
14. <i>How well has Senior Management implemented the Board Objective "To establish a consultative management culture"? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	3	17	25	18	19	19	
	'08	20	13	25	17	37	21	
	'09	3 16 6 20	14	28	27	21 38 24 51		
15. <i>How well is SAIT encouraging the development of innovative programs and courses"? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	7	24	37	17	9	7	
	'08	31	29	31	19	26	12	
	'09	4 33 6 35	29	41	16	6 25 8 24		
16. <i>Considering the foregoing, how much overall trust and confidence do you have in the SAIT President? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	14	29	32	17	8		
	'08	43	31	27	16	25		
	'09	16 47 12 48	36	25	18	10 26 9 27		
DEPT: ALL DEPTS. CONSOLIDATED								
RESPONSES: 2009:252 2008: 217 2007:283								
<i>Middle Management</i>			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. <i>Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.</i>	'07	21	23	25	12	12		
	'08	44	30	23	16	24	7	
	'09	14 44 24 50	26	27	10	13 29 13 23		

18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	16 41	25	18	18	14 32	9
	'08	13 34	21	27	15	19 34	
	'09	22 42	20	26	12	20 32	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	16 41	25	24	12	10 22	13
	'08	12 37	25	31	10	12 22	
	'09	21 49	28	31	9	11 20	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence (0) I Don't Know.	'07	19 49	30	27	17	7 24	
	'08	15 46	31	29	14	11 25	
	'09	22 50	28	23	16	10 26	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree or Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.	'07	16 49	33	28	13	10 23	
	'08	13 44	31	30	13	14 27	
	'09	20 50	30	21	14	15 29	
QUESTION		Yes	No				
PERCENTAGE RESPONSE 2007-2009							
22. Would you support the implementation of a campus daycare for the SAIT community? (Yes) (No)	'07	86	14				
	'08	79	21				
	'09	77	23				
23. Do you see a daycare as an enhancement for the attraction and retention of staff and students to SAIT? (Yes) (No)	'07	88	13				
	'08	83	17				
	'09	80	20				
24. Would you make use of a campus daycare if it were available? (Yes) (No)	'07	19	81				
	'08	17	83				
	'09	18	82				
DEPT: BLANK/OTHER							
RESPONSES: 2009: 98 2008: 80 2007:106							
Middle Management		5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	21 50	29	22	9	11 20	9
	'08	7 40	33	30	14	8 22	
	'09	25 46	21	31	13	10 23	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	16 47	31	19	12	10 22	12
	'08	4 31	27	31	1	10 11	
	'09	26 40	14	28	15	18 33	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	18 41	23	23	8	10 18	18
	'08	7 34	27	29	12	9 21	
	'09	21 43	22	37	12	9 21	

20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence (0) I Don't Know.	'07	24	33	27	10	7		
	'08	57				17		
		8	38	37	10	8		
	'09	46	24	28	21	18		
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree or Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree (0) I Don't Know.	'07	17	42	24	11	5		
	'08	59				16		
		8	25	42	15	11		
	'09	33	29	19	16	26		
DEPT: BUSINESS								
RESPONSES: 2009:15 2008:12 2007:12								
<i>Middle Management</i>		5	4	3	2	1	0	
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	25	8	8	8	8	42	
	'08	33				16		
		8	25	33	8	17		
	'09	33	13	20	13	25		
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	18	9	9	18	9	36	
	'08	27				27		
		8	25	42	0	25		
	'09	33	7	27	7	25		
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	18	9	27	0	9	36	
	'08	27				9		
		0	42	33	0	17		
	'09	42	20	20	13	17		
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence..	'07	9	36	36	18	0		
	'08	45				18		
		25	8	42	17	8		
	'09	33	7	20	27	25		
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	27	18	46	0	9		
	'08	45				9		
		17	50	8	17	8		
	'09	67	20	27	27	25		
DEPT: CENTRE FOR ACADEMIC LEARNER SERVICES								
RESPONSES: 2009: 10 2008: 9 2007:14								
<i>Middle Management</i>		5	4	3	2	1	0	
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	43	29	14	7	7	0	
	'08	71				14		
		33	33	0	22	11		
	'09	66	20	30	0	33		
							0	
							0	
							0	

18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	36 79	43	0	14	7 21	0
	'08	44 66	22	0	11	22 33	
	'09	50 70	20	20	10	0 10	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	43 63	21	29	0	7 7	0
	'08	33 44	11	33	11	11 22	
	'09	50 80	30	20	0	0 0	

20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence.	'07	43 79	36	7	7	7 14	
	'08	33 66	33	0	33	0 33	
	'09	60 90	30	10	0	0 0	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	21 71	50	7	7	14 21	
	'08	33 66	33	11	11	11 22	
	'09	40 80	40	10	0	10 10	

DEPT: CONSTRUCTION
RESPONSES: 2009: 34 2008: 32 2007: 39

<i>Middle Management</i>		5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	18 47	29	26	11	11 22	5
	'08	25 69	44	6	9	13 22	
	'09	44 71	27	21	0	9 9	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	16 40	24	24	16	11 27	8
	'08	28 48	22	22	6	16 22	
	'09	38 67	29	24	0	9 9	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	10 43	33	28	8	10 18	10
	'08	13 47	34	25	3	16 19	
	'09	35 62	27	29	0	9 9	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence..	'07	13 49	36	28	23	0 23	
	'08	26 62	36	19	10	10 20	
	'09	32 70	38	18	3	9 12	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	11 45	34	37	11	8 19	
	'08	19 57	38	25	6	13 19	
	'09	29 58	29	24	6	12 18	

DEPT: ENERGY								
RESPONSES: 2009: 8 2008: 8 2007: 12								
Middle Management			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	17	33	8	8	25	8	
	'08	40	25	25	38	33		
	'09	0	0	25	25	13		
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	17	25	8	8	33	8	
	'08	42	13	25	25	41		
	'09	0	0	38	13	38		
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	17	33	0	17	8	25	
	'08	50	38	38	13	25		
	'09	0	14	29	29	13		
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence..	'07	17	25	17	25	17		
	'08	42	25	50	0	42		
	'09	13	13	25	13	13		
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	17	25	17	8	33		
	'08	42	13	50	13	41		
	'09	13	13	25	13	13		
DEPT: HEALTH & PUBLIC SAFETY								
RESPONSES: 2009: 16 2008: 15 2007: 29								
Middle Management			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	15	37	19	26	4	
	'08	15	13	20	40	45		
	'09	0	44	31	19	27		
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	0	32	36	29	4	
	'08	0	0	13	47	65		
	'09	0	19	38	25	40		
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	14	25	32	14	14	
	'08	14	13	47	27	46		
	'09	0	44	44	6	13		

20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence	'07	0 14	14	39	36	11 47		
	'08	0 13	13	40	27	20 47		
	'09	6 44	38	32	13	13 26		
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree or Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	0 15	15	37	33	15 48		
	'08	0 13	13	47	20	20 40		
	'09	6 37	31	38	13	13 26		
DEPT: HEALTH, SAFETY & WELLNESS								
RESPONSES: 2009: n/a 2008: n/a 2007:1								
<i>Middle Management</i>			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'08	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'09	0	0	100	0	0	0	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'08	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'09	0	0	100	0	0	0	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'08	0	0	100	0	0	0	
	'09	0	0	100	0	0	0	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence	'07	0	0	0	0	0		
	'08	0	0	0	0	0		
	'09	0	0	0	0	0		
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree or Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	0	0	0	0	0		
	'08	0	0	0	0	0		
	'09	0	0	0	0	0		
DEPT: HOSPITALITY & TOURISM								
RESPONSES: 2009: 13 2008:14 2007:16								
<i>Middle Management</i>			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	38 51	13	19	13	13 26	6	
	'08	14 35	21	14	21	29 50	0	
	'09	15 54	39	15	0	31 31	0	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	19 50	31	19	13	13 26	6	
	'08	21 21	0	21	14	43 57	0	
	'09	15 46	31	15	8	31 39	0	

19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know	'07	27 54	27	20	13	13 26	0 0
	'08	14 35	21	21	21	21 42	
	'09	23 62	39	0	8	31 39	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence	'07	33 60	27	20	7	13 20	
	'08	14 28	14	21	21	29 50	
	'09	39 62	23	0	23	15 38	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree or Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	27 54	27	33	0	13 13	
	'08	14 28	14	14	14	43 57	
	'09	15 61	46	0	23	15 38	

DEPT: Centre for Instructional & Technology Development

RESPONSES: 2009: n/a 2008:0 2007:0

Middle Management		5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'08	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'09	-	-	-	-	-	-
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'08	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'09	-	-	-	-	-	-
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'08	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'09	-	-	-	-	-	-
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence.	'07	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'08	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'09	-	-	-	-	-	-
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'08	-	-	-	-	-	-
	'09	-	-	-	-	-	-

DEPT: INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECH.

RESPONSES: 2009: 24 2008:18 2007: 20

Middle Management		5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	20 30	10	35	20	10 30	5 0
	'08	6 17	11	33	22	28 48	
	'09	4 37	33	33	13	17 30	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	15 35	20	15	30	15 45	5 0
	'08	0 17	17	28	28	28 56	
	'09	4 30	26	26	17	26 43	

19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	15 35	20	20	15	15 30	15 22
	'08	0 11	11	33	11	22 33	
	'09	9 35	26	44	13	9 22	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence.	'07	15 45	30	25	20	10 30	
	'08	0 22	22	33	28	17 45	
	'09	4 44	42	33	13	8 21	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	20 40	20	25	25	10 35	
	'08	0 33	33	33	11	22 33	
	'09	13 39	26	35	9	17 26	

DEPT: MANUFACTURING & AUTOMATION							
1. RESPONSES: 2009:11 2008:12 2007:16							
Middle Management		5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	31 62	31	19	13	6 19	0 0
	'08	75 92	17	8	0	0 0	
	'09	64 73	9	18	9	0 9	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	31 62	31	0	25	6 31	6 0
	'08	67 84	17	17	0	0 0	
	'09	46 73	27	9	9	9 18	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	31 62	31	25	6	0 6	6 0
	'08	83 91	8	8	0	0 0	
	'09	55 73	18	18	9	0 9	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence.	'07	40 67	27	20	13	0 13	
	'08	73 91	18	9	0	0 0	
	'09	55 73	18	18	9	0 9	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	40 67	27	20	0	13 13	
	'08	55 91	36	9	0	0 0	
	'09	46 64	18	18	18	0 18	

DEPT: TRANSPORTATION RESPONSES: 2009:20 2008:17 2007:18								
<i>Middle Management</i>			5	4	3	2	1	0
17. Overall do you feel your Dean is doing a good job? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	12	12	47	18	12	0	
	'08	24	53	35	6	30	6	
	'09	0	15	45	15	10	25	
18. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage "people" responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	11	22	17	22	28	0	
	'08	33	0	29	41	12	50	
	'09	29	16	32	21	16	32	
19. How would you rate your Dean in terms of ability to manage administrative/technical responsibilities? (5) Very Well (4) Well (3) Average (2) Poorly (1) Very Poorly (0) I Don't Know.	'07	0	33	33	22	11	0	
	'08	33	6	24	53	6	6	
	'09	30	11	58	16	5	11	
20. How much trust and confidence do you have in your Dean? (5) A Great Deal (4) Quite a Bit (3) A Little (2) Very Little (1) No Confidence.	'07	6	22	39	17	17		
	'08	28	0	5	18	12	34	
	'09	5	21	37	11	26	5	
21. There is effective two-way communication between my Dean and me. (5) Strongly Agree (4) Agree (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree (2) Disagree (1) Strongly Disagree.	'07	6	33	33	22	6		
	'08	39	6	59	12	18	28	
	'09	65	20	35	10	20	6	
		55				24	15	
						25		

01/13/06

2009 ACIFA Climate Survey Results

Question 1: My institution demonstrates a strong commitment to improving my teaching skills.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
23.2%	43.9%	16.1%	12.3%	4.5%
67.1%		16.8%		

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.69	2004/05	2.9	1999/00	2.7
2008/09	3.66	2003/04	2.7	1998/99	2.9
2007/08	3.55	2002/03	2.9	1997/98	2.4 (new question)
2006/07	3.3	2001/02	3.0		
2005/06	3.2	2000/01	2.7		

Question 2: My institution demonstrates a strong commitment to improving my discipline-specific knowledge.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
7.1%	44.5%	22.6%	20.0%	5.8%
51.6%		25.8%		

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.27	2004/05	2.5	1999/00	2.3
2008/09	3.14	2003/04	2.3	1998/99	2.5
2007/08	3.14	2002/03	2.4	1997/98	2.5 (new question)
2006/07	3.0	2001/02	2.5		
2005/06	2.8	2000/01	2.3		

Question 3: I have enough time to attend to my professional development needs.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
5.2%	21.9%	25.8%	32.9%	14.2%
27.1%		47.1%		

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.71	2005/06	2.3	2001/02	2.1
2008/09	2.65	2004/05	2.2	2000/01	2.1
2007/08	2.69	2003/04	2.0	1999/00	2.1
2006/07	2.5	2002/03	2.2	1998/99	2.2 (new question)

Question 4: Senior administration communicates openly with faculty.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
9.0%	28.4%	23.9%	21.3%	17.4%
37.4%		38.7%		

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.90	2005/06	2.3	2001/02	2.0
2008/09	2.73	2004/05	2.1	2000/01	1.6
2007/08	2.94	2003/04	1.9	1999/00	1.8
2006/07	2.5	2002/03	1.9	1998/99	2.5 (new question)

Question 5: I am informed in a timely manner about important changes that affect me.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
5.8%	31.0%	27.1%	21.3%	14.8%
36.8%		36.1%		

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.92	2005/06	2.5	2001/02	2.3
2008/09	2.72	2004/05	2.3	2000/01	2.1
2007/08	2.77	2003/04	2.1	1999/00	2.0
2006/07	2.6	2002/03	2.2	1998/99	2.4 (new question)

Question 6: Input from faculty is sought AND seriously considered in decision-making at my institution.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
6.5%	26.5%	24.5%	24.5%	18.1%
	33%		42.6%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 2.79	2004/05 1.9	1999/00 1.6
2008/09 2.62	2003/04 1.8	1998/99 2.3
2007/08 2.69	2002/03 1.9	1997/98 2.2
2006/07 2.4	2001/02 1.9	1996/97 1.8
2005/06 2.3	2000/01 1.6	

Question 7: Senior administration understands day-to-day challenges faced by instructors.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
3.2%	23.9%	18.7%	31.6%	22.6%
	27.1%		54.2%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 2.54	2004/05 1.8	1999/00 1.5
2008/09 2.40	2003/04 1.7	1998/99 2.1
2007/08 2.46	2002/03 1.8	1997/98 1.8
2006/07 2.3	2001/02 1.9	1996/97 1.7
2005/06 2.0	2000/01 1.5	

Question 8: When making decisions, this institution refers to one or all of: a mission statement, a statement of goals, or a statement of values.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
8.4%	37.4%	35.5%	12.9%	5.8%
	45.8%		18.7%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 3.30	2004/05 2.8	1999/00 2.6
2008/09 3.30	2003/04 2.7	1998/99 2.8
2007/08 3.30	2002/03 2.9	1997/98 2.9
2006/07 3.1	2001/02 3.0	1996/97 3.4
2005/06 2.9	2000/01 2.5	

Question 9: Outstanding performance by instructors is rewarded.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
3.9%	29.7%	28.4%	23.2%	14.8%
	33.6%		38%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 2.85	2004/05 2.1	1999/00 1.8
2008/09 2.76	2003/04 1.9	1998/99 2.3
2007/08 2.69	2002/03 2.2	1997/98 2.2
2006/07 2.5	2001/02 2.2	1996/97 2.1
2005/06 2.5	2000/01 1.9	

Question 10: My institution demonstrates a strong commitment to my health and well being.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
6.5%	36.1%	29.7%	20.0%	7.7%
	41.6%		27.7%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 3.14	2004/05 2.4	1999/00 1.8
2008/09 2.88	2003/04 2.1	1998/99 2.3
2007/08 2.98	2002/03 2.2	1997/98 2.1 (new question)
2006/07 2.8	2001/02 2.2	
2005/06 2.6	2000/01 1.9	

Question 11: Academic council has a meaningful impact on academic decisions.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
3.9%	18.1%	56.8%	10.3%	11.0%
	22%		21.3%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 2.94	2005/06 2.7	2001/02 2.6
2008/09 2.84	2004/05 2.6	2000/01 2.2
2007/08 2.92	2003/04 2.4	1999/00 2.3
2006/07 2.7	2002/03 2.5	1998/99 2.6 (new question)

Question 12: The president of this institution provides effective leadership.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
14.8%	34.2%	23.9%	13.5%	13.5%
	49%		27%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 3.23	2003/04 2.1	1998/99 3.3
2008/09 3.16	2002/03 2.3	1997/98 2.8
2007/08 3.30	2001/02 2.4	1996/97 2.4
2006/07 3.0	2000/01 1.8	
2005/06 2.7		
2004/05 2.4	1999/00 2.0	

Question 13: I have the resources I need to do my job effectively.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
9.7%	47.7%	20.0%	16.8%	5.8%
	57.4%		22.6%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 3.39	2005/06 2.9	2001/02 2.4
2008/09 3.20	2004/05 2.6	2000/01 2.2
2007/08 3.20	2003/04 2.4	1999/00 2.2
2006/07 3.1	2002/03 2.5	1998/99 2.6 (new question)

******(Institution-specific questions begin here.)******

Question 14: The current campus Commercial food services (Chartwells/Franchise) provides satisfactory services, i.e.: quality, price, availability.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
0.0%	9.7%	25.2%	29.0%	36.1%
	9.7%		65.1%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 2.08 (SAIT only)	2006/07 3.8 (SAIT only)	2004/05 3.9 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09 2.05 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2005/06 3.8 (SAIT only; new question)	
2007/08 1.91 (SAIT only)		

Question 15: Instructor evaluation should not be based solely on the SIR II report.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
71.0%	20.6%	3.9%	1.3%	3.2%
	91.6%		4.5%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10 4.55 (SAIT only)	2006/07 4.1 (SAIT only)	2004/05 4.1 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09 4.30 (SAIT only)	2005/06 4.0 (SAIT only; new question)	
2007/08 4.35 (SAIT only)		

Question 16: Documents provided to you by x-Docs are delivered on time and prepared according to your instructions.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
13.5%	40.0%	34.2%	9.0%	3.2%
	53.5%			12.2%

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.52 (SAIT only)	2006/07	2.6 (SAIT only)	2004/05	2.4 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09	3.45 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2005/06	2.6 (SAIT only; new question)		
2007/08	3.39 (SAIT only)				

Question 17: Scheduling (timetabling) allows sufficient course preparation time.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
2.6%	33.5%	22.6%	24.5%	16.8%
	36.1%			41.3%

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.81 (SAIT only)	2007/08	2.73 (SAIT only)	2005/06	4.5 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09	2.66 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2006/07	4.6 (SAIT only)		

Question 18: Campus facilities are clean, safe and well maintained.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
5.2%	35.5%	19.4%	27.7%	12.3%
	40.7%			40%

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.94 (SAIT only)	2007/08	2.62 (SAIT only)	2005/06	2.2 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09	2.70 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2006/07	2.5 (SAIT only)		

Question 19: Faculty morale has deteriorated at SAIT during the last year.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
16.8%	34.2%	26.5%	17.4%	5.2%
	51%		22.6%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.40 (SAIT only)	2007/08	3.28 (SAIT only)	2005/06	3.7 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09	3.36 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2006/07	3.4 (SAIT only)		

Question 20: The increase of Management positions has improved the effectiveness of SAIT.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
1.9%	8.4%	40.0%	20.6%	29.0%
	10.3%		49.6%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.34 (SAIT only)	2007/08	3.68 (SAIT only)
2008/09	2.31 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject, which reverses the ranking emphasis)	2006/07	3.6 (SAIT only)
		2005/06	3.7 (SAIT only; new question)

Question 21: The amount of weekly work you are expected to do goes beyond your regular hours.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
31.0%	38.7%	15.5%	13.5%	1.3%
	69.7%		14.8%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.85 (SAIT only)	2007/08	3.77 (SAIT only)	2005/06	4.1 (SAIT only; new question)
2008/09	3.86 (SAIT only; new wording of same subject)	2006/07	4.1 (SAIT only)		

Question 22: There is pressure on faculty to maintain student numbers at the expense of academic standards.

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
37.4%	29.7%	16.1%	15.5%	1.3%
	67.1%		16.8%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	3.86 (SAIT only)	2008/09	3.73 (SAIT only)	2005/06	3.9 (SAIT only; new question)
		2007/08	3.79 (SAIT only)		
		2006/07	3.9 (SAIT only)		

Question 23: Do current external contracted services meet your daily academic needs?

Strongly agree—5	Agree—4	Neither agree nor disagree—3	Disagree—2	Strongly disagree—1
3.9%	22.6%	42.6%	20.6%	10.3%
	26.5%		30.9%	

Means (out of a possible 5)

2009/10	2.89 (SAIT only; new question)	2008/09	2.80 (SAIT only; new question)	2006/07	3.9 (SAIT only)
		2007/08	2.68 (SAIT only)	2005/06	3.8 (SAIT only; new question)

Administration and interpretation of the survey

Questionnaires are provided electronically by email to all members of the academic staff associations at participating institutions in November. Results are tabulated through the web-based Survey Monkey. The survey is based on climate surveys used by organizations involved in total quality management programs. The literature on climate surveys suggests a strong relationship between perceived climate and absenteeism, turnover, and level of union activity (e.g., grievances). This survey is meant to provide a broad overview of organizational climate and highlight areas of concern for further study by administrators and faculty members.

While the survey is not based on a random sample, the rates of return provide support for the validity of the results. Further, a number of institutions have commissioned external surveys that broadly replicate the results of the ACIFA survey. These data represent perceptions and must be interpreted carefully. Of specific concern is the use of means (averages) in results. The data collected does not contain the metric properties necessary to calculate means and standard deviations. Despite this, means are an important component in showing smaller changes in perception over time and are included.

ACIFA 2009 Climate Survey Results

Institution	Year	%	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13
ACIFA	2009	38	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6	3.3	2.9	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.2
Provincial averages	2008	45	3.5	3.3	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.4	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.2
	2007	47	3.5	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.7	3.4	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.3
ACAD	2009	52	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.7	1.7	2.7	1.8	2.5	2.6	1.9	2.1
	2008	71	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.0	1.5	3.6	1.6	2.6	2.9	1.8	1.9
	2007	57	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.3	1.8	3.1	1.8	2.3	3.1	2.4	2.3
Bow Valley College	2009	29	3.6	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.8	3.6	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.5	3.4
	2008	27	3.5	3.5	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.3	3.3
	2007	18	3.3	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.1	2.6	2.4	3.0	3.2	3.3
Grant MacEwan	2009	10	3.9	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.8	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.5
	2008	14	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.4	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.5
	2007	7	2.7	3.1	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.7	3.4	2.8	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.3
Grande Prairie	2009	40	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.9	3.1
	2008	39	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.7	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.9	3.5
	2007	44	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.9	4.1	3.7
Keyano College	2009	47	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.9	2.3	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.7
	2008	49	3.6	3.6	3.0	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.9	2.5	3.5	3.1	2.8	2.9
	2007	60	3.6	3.5	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.3	3.0	2.5	3.1	2.8	2.4	3.0
Lakeland College	2009	47	3.9	3.8	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.5
	2008	54	3.8	3.7	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.7	3.6
	2007	76	3.8	3.7	3.0	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.5	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.5
Northbridge College	2009	20	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.6	3.3
	2008	26	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.6	3.5	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.1
	2007	28	3.6	3.3	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.2
Medicine Hat College	2009	40	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.5
	2008	46	3.6	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.5	3.5
	2007	43	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.6	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.5
Mount Royal University	2009	14	4.3	3.4	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.5	4.3	3.6
	2008	13	4.2	3.1	2.7	3.7	3.6	3.4	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.5	4.1	3.5
	2007	12	4.2	3.1	2.8	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	3.4	3.4	3.6	4.2	3.7
NAIT	2009	27	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.0	3.1	2.8	2.8	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.4	3.3
	2008	27	3.8	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.5
	2007	18	3.7	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.6	3.4
Northern Lakes	2009	49	3.7	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.5	3.1	3.6	3.2	3.3	3.6
	2008	58	3.4	3.2	2.9	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.4	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	3.4
	2007	95	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.7	3.1	3.7	3.2	3.8	3.6
NorQuest College	2009	46	3.0	3.0	2.6	2.6	2.9	2.5	2.3	3.2	2.4	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.0
	2008	60	3.4	3.3	2.8	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.6	3.3	2.6	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.3
	2007	58	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.7	3.4	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.4	3.3
Olds College	2009	55	3.2	3.2	2.4	1.9	2.3	1.9	1.9	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.3
	2008	93	3.8	3.7	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.6	2.4	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1
	2007	68	4.0	3.9	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.8	2.4	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.1	3.5	2.9
Portage College	2009	76	3.6	3.6	3.2	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.3	3.2	3.1	3.4	2.8	3.3	3.3
	2008	69	3.6	3.5	3.2	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.3	3.2	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.9	3.4
	2007	86	3.4	3.4	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.2	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.1	3.3
SAIT	2009	23	3.7	3.3	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.4
	2008	29	3.7	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.4	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.2
	2007	35	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.5	3.3	2.7	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.2

