

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 839

JC 000 202

TITLE Pennsylvania College of Technology Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Survey Report, 1999.

INSTITUTION Pennsylvania Coll. of Technology, Williamsport. Office of Strategic Planning and Research.

PUB DATE 1999-12-00

NOTE 39p.

PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Employee Attitudes; *Employees; Employer Employee Relationship; Job Satisfaction; Surveys; Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; Work Attitudes; *Work Environment

IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania College of Technology

ABSTRACT

This report provides the results of the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey at the Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College). The instrument was designed by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness at North Carolina State University. The primary purpose of the survey is to assess the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to promote more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff and administrators. PACE classifies institutions as being along a continuum of the following climate types: (1) coercive; (2) competitive; (3) consultative; and (4) collaborative. The first two types are considered to be less favorable. This continuum is measured across six domains: (1) formal influence; (2) communication; (3) collaboration; (4) organizational structure; (5) work/design/technology; and (6) student focus. The survey, completed by the college's faculty and staff, is designed so that individual institutions can compare themselves to national norms. Following are the major findings at Penn College. The most favorable aspects of the college climate were student focus and work/design technology; overall the college climate rates as a healthy mid-range "consultative" system and service staff had the poorest perceptions of the climate in relation to other employee groups such as senior staff (15+ years) and new staff (1-4 years) who had more favorable perceptions. A detailed analysis of the results, tables, and explanations of the methodology are included. The survey is appended. (AF)

ED 453 839

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Cunningham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Institutional Research



PACE - 1999

Office of Strategic Planning and Research



TC000202

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2

**Personal Assessment of the College Environment
(PACE)
Survey Report
1999**

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
Strategic Planning & Research Office**

Published December 1999

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
STRATEGIC PLANNING & RESEARCH OFFICE**

Stephen Cunningham, Director
Patricia Fickes, Institutional Research Specialist
Kelly Fairfax, Institutional Research Assistant
Sharon Scarfo, Secretary

PACE SURVEY REPORT – 1999

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>	
PART I	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PART II	INTRODUCTION	1
PART III	ANALYSIS & FINDINGS	3
	Section 1	3
	Section 2	4
	Section 3	5
	Section 4	6
PART IV	METHODOLOGY & PROCEDURES	8
PART V	DATA TABLES	
	Section A – Response Rates	
	Table 1: Response Rates by Sex	10
	Table 2: Response Rates by Race/Ethnicity	10
	Table 3: Response Rates by Length of Service	11
	Table 4: Response Rates by Job Classification	11
	Table 5: Response Rates by Organizational Area	12
	Section B – Survey Responses	
	Table 6: Overall Climate Ratings compared by Demographic Groups	13
	Table 7: Climate Factor Ratings – Penn College vs. National Norms	15
	Table 8: Climate Factor Ratings by Length of Service	16
	Table 9: Climate Factor Ratings by Job Classification	17
	Table 10: Climate Factor Ratings by Organizational Area	18
	Table 11: Climate Factor Ratings by Academic School	19
	Table 12: Climate Item Ratings	20
PART VI	APPENDICES	
	A – Survey Cover Memo (President Gilmour to Full-Time Employees)	23
	B – PACE survey form	24
	C – Penn College-specific supplemental survey form	26

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE SURVEY REPORT
1999
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Survey is an instrument designed by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) at North Carolina State University. Based on a synthesis of the literature on leadership and organizational systems, PACE classifies institutions along a continuum of four climate types: 1)coercive, 2)competitive, 3)consultative, and 4)collaborative. PACE attempts to measure this continuum across six domains: 1)formal influence, 2)communication, 3)collaboration, 4)organizational structure, 5)work design/ technology, and 6)student focus. The survey allows institutions to compare their organizational climates to national norms. Last March, 294 (46%) of the full-time Penn College faculty and staff completed PACE. Major findings include the following:

- overall, the Penn College climate is healthy, with a 3.69 score indicating a mid-range consultative system, compared to a 3.55 PACE norm;
- overall, faculty (3.65), classified (3.75) and APT (3.74) staff climate ratings are very similar;
- service staff have the least positive perceptions (3.42), but this is based on only a small response;
- senior (15+ years of service) faculty/staff and newer personnel have the most positive perceptions; of those in-between (5 to 14 years of service), ratings generally decline with length of service;
- student focus (3.88) and work design/technology (3.87) are the most favorable aspects of the College climate;
- collaboration (3.54) and communication (3.57) are relatively less favorable elements of the Penn College climate; however, communication, along with organizational structure (3.58), are the two domains in which faculty/staff rated Penn College considerably higher than the norm;
- none of the 61 measurement items fell in the least favorable categories (coercive or competitive);
- several specific areas of excellence were noted, led by the following:
 - relevance of jobs to College mission (4.34)
 - responsibility for meaningful work (4.34)
 - the College prepares students for a career (4.29);
- several specific areas needing improvement were noted, led by:
 - ability to appropriately influence College direction (3.17)
 - Governance gives voice/represents me in campus affairs (3.27)
 - decisions are made at an appropriate level (3.31).

Readers are encouraged to explore these and other findings within the body of this report.

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE SURVEY REPORT
1999**

INTRODUCTION

This report presents results of the 1999 Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Survey administered to all full-time faculty and staff at Pennsylvania College of Technology (Penn College). PACE is a survey instrument designed by George A. Baker III and the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) at North Carolina State University. Penn College is using PACE as the first phase of a three-part study of institutional climate. Part 2 will address institutional leadership and part 3 will address faculty/staff satisfaction with administrative services. This document is a condensed and modified presentation of the report prepared for Penn College by George Baker and Brian P. Miller of NILIE in June 1999. Readers interested in reviewing the original NILIE report may contact Strategic Planning and Research.

The primary purpose of PACE is to assess “the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to promote more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators.” In addition to internal comparisons, PACE provides the opportunity for benchmark comparisons against the PACE norm base. It will also provide the College with a baseline set of measures for future assessments of the College climate. The instrument allows for fifteen College-specific items. The NILIE report posed six research questions, which have been condensed and modified into four questions for this report:

- 1) How representative is the survey sample of the total Penn College population?
- 2) How do faculty/staff perceptions of the overall College climate differ from PACE norms, and by different sub-populations?
- 3) How do faculty/staff perceptions of the six College climate factors differ from PACE norms, and by different sub-populations?
- 4) What are the strongest and weakest specific elements of the Penn College climate?

This report consists of six parts:

Part I	Executive Summary
Part II	Introduction
Part III	Analysis & Findings
Part IV	Methodology & Procedures
Part V	Summary Data Tables
Part VI	Appendices

Background and Definitions

Organizational *climate* is a subset of organizational culture, defined as the prevailing condition that affects satisfaction and productivity (Baker et al, 1992). The collective pattern of individual behaviors in an organization influences organizational climate. Individual perceptions of these behavior patterns have been recognized as important determinants of quality, productivity, and employee satisfaction (Baker et al, 1992).

NILIE has synthesized from the literature four leadership or organizational systems ranging from coercive to collaborative. System 1 (coercive) is the least desirable climate. Most organizations operate at the System 2 (competitive) or 3 (consultative) levels. As opposed to these more naturally occurring climates, the collaborative system (level 4) is considered to be most desirable, resulting in superior communication, productivity and job satisfaction (Likert, 1967).

Coercive systems (level 1) have a highly structured, task-oriented, and authoritative leadership management style. The system is based on the assumption that employees are inherently lazy. To make them productive, managers must keep after them constantly.

Collaborative systems (level 4), in contrast, are change-oriented, with appropriate decision-making delegated to teams. Collaborative system leaders seek trust and confidence in their followers, who respond with positive views of their leaders. The system is based on the notion that work is a source of satisfaction, as people have a need for achievement and productivity. Complex tasks require people to work together, voluntarily, with self-direction and self-control. More collaborative systems result in greater productivity, dedication and loyalty (Likert, 1967).

NILIE has conducted over 70 PACE studies in the past decade, of which more than 60 have been used to formulate the PACE national norms referred to in this report. These include colleges ranging in size from 1,200 to 22,000 students, at multi-campus institutions, community college districts and statewide systems. Most of the normative data come from public two-year colleges. Few institutions have achieved a collaborative (System 4) climate, except in some areas, with some categories of employees. Thus, a level 4 climate remains the target for colleges to pursue through planning, collaboration and development.

PART III – ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

The introduction posed four questions, corresponding to the data tables presented in part V. Tables 1 through 5 present response rates broken out by different sub-populations, to demonstrate how well the survey response sample represents the total population. Table 6 presents overall climate ratings compared to PACE norms and broken out by different sub-populations. Tables 7 through 11 present the six climate factor ratings (plus the College-specific ratings) compared to PACE norms and broken out by four different sub-populations. Table 12 presents each of the 61 climate items, ranked for purposes of highlighting the strongest and weakest climate elements.

It is important to recognize that these survey results apply only to full-time faculty and staff. Part-time personnel may differ from full-time faculty and staff in many substantial ways.

All statements in Part III using the term “significant” result from statistical tests at 5% error (significance) levels.

1) Response Rates & Bias (Tables 1 - 5)

Overall, 294 faculty and staff completed the PACE survey, representing 46% of the 636 total full-time personnel. In order to generalize results, respondents must be representative of the total full-time College population. If not, and different sub-populations tend to have different perceptions of the College climate, the survey results and ratings could be biased. Response rates were tested for significant differences by sex (Table 1), race (Table 2), length of service (Table 3), job classification (Table 4) and organizational area/academic school (Table 5). Test results show that survey respondents were not entirely representative of all full-time personnel.

The lowest (and statistically significant) response rate across all the demographic items was among employees classified as Service staff (n = 15, 12%). Administrative/ Professional/ Technical (APT) and Classified staff had the highest response rates (64% and 63% respectively), while Faculty (44%) were near the College norm.

Response rates were also significantly related to length of service at the College. Faculty and staff with 15 or more years of service responded at a much higher rate (53%) than did those with fewer than five years (36%). However, climate ratings reported by these two groups were very similar (see Table 8), so the differences in response rates probably tend to cancel each other out.

Men also responded at a significantly lower rate (30%) than did women (45%). However, when Service staff are excluded, the male-female difference is not significant (i.e., the male-female difference is accounted for by the differences in job classifications). Overall, response rates did not differ significantly by race or organizational area.

Thus, the only bias in the sample of any practical significance is that due to the low Service staff response. Service staff who did respond tended to rate the College climate considerably lower than others (see Table 6). Because of this bias, the ‘true’ College climate ratings are estimated to

be about 0.04 lower than those presented throughout this report. The results presented in the remainder of this report should not be considered representative of the Service staff population.

2a) Overall Penn College Climate Ratings vs. PACE Norms (Table 6)

The PACE satisfaction items are based on a scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Mean ratings are interpreted to correspond to the four climate levels previously described. Mean ratings under 2.00 correspond to System 1 (coercive), 2.00 to 2.99 corresponds to System 2 (competitive), 3.00 to 3.99 corresponds to System 3 (consultative), and 4.00 or higher corresponds to System 4 (collaborative).

The overall Penn College climate rating, as perceived by faculty and staff, is 3.69, significantly higher than the PACE norm of 3.55. This rating places the College toward the high range of the System 3 (consultative) management climate. However, significant variations in perception do exist across different demographic groups.

2b) Overall Penn College Climate Ratings by Sub-groups (Table 6)

As noted earlier, Service staff have significantly poorer perceptions (3.42) of the College climate relative to other employee groups (Classified – 3.75, APT – 3.74, Faculty – 3.65). However, the Service ratings are based on only 15 responses out of 126 staff. In addition to producing bias in the overall College ratings, this low response also means that there could be a wide degree of error in the Service rating estimates (i.e., if more Service staff had responded, their ratings could have come out considerably higher or lower than 3.42).

Also noted earlier, climate ratings are significantly correlated with length of service at the College. Faculty and staff here less than a year had the highest ratings (4.02). Then scores tend to decline with length of service: 1 to 4 years (3.72), 5 to 9 years (3.61), 10 to 14 years (3.51). However, this trend reverses direction among faculty and staff who have put in 15 or more years of service (3.79).

The overall climate ratings were very similar across a wide range of organizational areas, with one exception. Integrated Studies faculty rated the climate significantly lower (3.37) than the College norm. Other areas ranged only from 3.50 (work area not given) and 3.55 (Industrial/Engineering Technologies) to 3.84 (General Services, Human Resources, Strategic Planning and Research combined) and 3.88 (Transportation Technologies).

Climate ratings were not significantly related to race and sex. Male-female ratings were remarkably similar (3.69 and 3.68 respectively). Non-white faculty and staff rated the climate considerably lower (3.17) than white employees (3.71), but the minority response sample was too small (5) to make any significant conclusions.

One special item was included in the demographic section, though it is not a true demographic item. Faculty and staff were asked for their preference regarding the College's primary mission, from the following choices: technical training school, technical college, community college, four-year college or "the college as we are today." Over two-thirds chose the status quo and another 17%

selected either technical college or training school. Not surprisingly, these individuals were most satisfied with the College climate (3.77, 3.65, 3.73 respectively). The remaining 14% preferred that the College either revert to a community college, or become primarily a four-year college. These individuals were significantly less satisfied with the current climate (3.10, 3.48 respectively).

3a) Penn College Climate Factor Ratings vs. PACE Norms (Table 7)

The PACE instrument measures climate satisfaction across six broad domains or factors: formal influence, communication, collaboration, organizational structure, work design/ technology, and student focus. Most of the six College-specific items relate to the College mission and focus, but because the College specially designed them, no PACE norms are available for comparison to this factor. The six standardized climate factors were rated higher than the PACE norms across the board by College faculty and staff.

Student focus (3.88) and work design/technology (3.87) are the most highly rated College climate factors, but they do not differ significantly from the PACE norms. Collaboration (3.54), communication (3.57) and organizational structure (3.58) were rated relatively lower than other College climate factors. However, the latter two factors were the two domains in which Penn College was rated considerably higher than the PACE norms (3.34 and 3.39 respectively). In addition to being the lowest rated College factor, collaboration showed the smallest margin over the comparable PACE norms (3.54 to 3.50). Satisfaction with the College mission and focus (3.69) was the third highest rated College climate factor.

3b) Penn College Climate Factor Ratings by Sub-groups (Tables 8 - 11)

Penn College climate factor ratings are compared according to length of service (Table 8), job classification (Table 9), organizational area (Table 10), and academic school (Table 11).

As noted previously, overall College climate ratings of newer employees are nearly identical to senior faculty and staff. However, differences do emerge when we look at specific climate factors. Newer (less than 5 years at Penn College) faculty and staff are relatively more satisfied with the level of formal influence (3.88) and communication (3.77) at the College than the average College employee (3.66, 3.57 respectively). Faculty/staff with 5 to 14 years of service are relatively less satisfied with the level of communication at the College (3.40) compared to those with less (3.77) or more (3.66) time at the College. Senior faculty/staff are consistently more satisfied with each climate factor.

Comparing climate factors by job classification (Table 9), two primary differences stand out. First, classified (3.61) and service staff (3.21) are considerably less satisfied with their level of formal influence than are faculty (3.64) and APT staff (3.76). Second, faculty are relatively less satisfied with the level of collaboration (3.38) and the College mission/focus (3.57) than are the average College staff (3.54, 3.69 respectively).

Variations in climate factors are relatively consistent across broad College organizational areas (Table 10), but differences do exist among faculty across different academic schools (Table 11).

Due to small sample sizes from each school, none of the differences are statistically significant. Also given the small samples, schools with similar ratings were grouped together for presentation in Table 11 (Construction + Industrial; Health + Hospitality; Natural Resource + Transportation).

As noted previously, compared to their peers, Integrated Studies faculty rated the overall College climate significantly poorer. In particular, they were less satisfied with the College's student focus (3.43) compared to the faculty norm (3.81).

Compared to their peers, Business and Computer faculty were relatively more satisfied with communication (3.84) and formal influence (3.99) at the College. They were relatively less satisfied with the level of collaboration (3.43) and organizational structure (3.59).

Natural Resource and Transportation faculty were likewise relatively less satisfied with the level of collaboration (3.47) and more satisfied with their formal influence (3.99). They were also relatively more satisfied with the organizational structure (3.84) and College mission/ focus (3.93).

Construction and Industrial faculty were also relatively more satisfied with the organizational structure (3.65) and student focus (3.94). They were among the most dissatisfied however, with College communications (3.42).

Health and Hospitality faculty were very satisfied with the College's student focus (4.01). They were relatively less satisfied with the level of collaboration (3.31) and formal influence (3.52).

4) Penn College Climate Item Ratings (Table 12)

Each of the seven climate factor ratings is comprised of anywhere from six to eleven specific survey items. None of the 61 specific measurement items fell within the least favorable rating categories (coercive or competitive). On the other hand, eight items fell within the highest (level 4), collaborative system classification. These eight items represent specific areas of excellence for the College, in the eyes of faculty and staff. Half of these were in the work design/technology domain:

- my job is relevant to the College mission (4.34);
- I'm responsible for meaningful work (4.34);
- my skills are appropriate for my job (4.23);
- accuracy is expected of me in my job (4.21).

Two of the areas of excellence fall within the student focus domain:

- the College prepares students for a career (4.29);
- students receive an excellent education here (4.19).

The other two relate to the College mission:

- the mission of the institution is appropriate for the College (4.08);

- actions of the College reflect its mission (4.11).

While none of the 61 items fell in the lower two levels, eight specific areas needing improvement were noted. These eight weak spots were scattered across six of the seven different domains (excluding only the student focus domain):

- 1) ability to appropriately influence direction of the College (3.17);
- 2) Governance gives voice/represents me in campus affairs (3.27);
- 3) decisions are made at an appropriate level (3.31);
- 4) open/ethical communication is practiced (3.38);
- 5) opportunities for advancement (3.40);
- 6) College teams use problem-solving techniques (3.42);
- 7) College is appropriately organized (3.42);
- 8) spirit of cooperation exists at the College (3.43).

Conclusions

Penn College has a relatively healthy campus climate, compared to the normative data available from prior PACE studies. In the four-level framework of organizational systems prescribed by NILIE researchers, the College rates as a mid-range consultative (level 3) system. Other than Service staff, who responded at a very low rate, the climate ratings are consistent across different personnel classifications. Senior staff (in terms of experience) and newer staff are somewhat more satisfied with the College climate than those in-between.

The College climate is considered particularly strong in terms of its student focus, work design/technology, and relatively strong compared to our peers in terms of communications and organizational structure. In general, collaboration is the element of the campus climate needing the most improvement. More specifically there are concerns about open communications, the amount of influence and representation individuals have in College decision-making, and opportunities for advancement. These findings provide a number of useful guidelines and benchmarks for phases two and three of the College climate study and for possible future assessments of the College environment.

PART IV – METHODOLOGY & PROCEDURES

Measurement Instrument

The PACE survey (see appendix B), adapted by NILIE from Likert's (1967) Systems Analysis instrument, was first employed in a case study at Miami-Dade Community College (Roueché & Baker, 1987). The overall PACE instrument has shown a coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of 0.97, indicating that it has a high degree of internal reliability (i.e., participants respond consistently to similar items).

PACE is a one-page (front-to-back), optically scanned survey, divided into six factors or conceptual domains: 1) formal influence, 2) communication, 3) collaboration, 4) organizational structure, 5) work design/ technology, and 6) student focus. Respondents are asked to rate 8 to 11 items for each of the six factors. Each item is rated on a five-point scale, ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Five demographic items are also included.

In addition to the 55 standardized satisfaction items and five demographic items, PACE allows the College to ask an additional 10 satisfaction items and 5 demographic items of local interest. President's Council, in collaboration with Strategic Planning and Research staff, developed six supplemental satisfaction items, four demographic items, and one special item (ascertaining preferences regarding the College mission). The one page (front-to-back) supplemental question sheet (see appendix C) also included a section for open-ended comments.

Administration Procedures

The PACE survey was administered to 636 full-time faculty and staff at Penn College in March 1999. The survey was delivered through interoffice mail, attached to a cover memo from President Gilmour (see appendix A). Surveys were returned to the Strategic Planning and Research office anonymously, thus no follow-up mailings were attempted.

Survey Processing

Strategic Planning and Research staff collected completed surveys, tallied response rates, and checked responses (to ensure proper completion). 294 (44.7%) usable surveys were prepared for return shipping to NILIE. NILIE staff processed the op-scan forms, producing a data file, data tables and written report.

Statistical Analysis Methods

Planning and Research staff performed all statistical tests in this report at 5% (or lower) significance levels. Chi-square tests were conducted to analyze response rates for representativeness. T-tests were used to test Penn College ratings against the PACE norms and to compare sub-groups.

References

- Baker, G. A. & Miller, B. P. (1999). *Personal assessment of the college environment (PACE): A report for Pennsylvania College of Technology*. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University.
- Baker, G. A. & Associates. (1992). *Cultural leadership*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Roueche, J. E. & Baker, G. A. (1987). *Access and excellence: The open-door college*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.

DATA TABLES

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 1
RESPONSE RATES
BY SEX

<u>Sex</u>	FullTime Staff/ Faculty	% of Total	Survey Responses	
			N	Rate
Female	277	44%	126	45%
Male	359	56%	108	30%
not given			60	
COLLEGE TOTAL	636	100%	294	46%

1999
TABLE 2
RESPONSE RATES
BY RACE/ETHNICITY

<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>	FullTime Staff/ Faculty	% of Total	Survey Responses	
			N	Rate
African-American	12	1.9%	4	33%
Asian-American	5	0.8%	1	20%
Non-white (minority) sub-total	17	2.7%	5	29%
White	619	97.3%	266	43%
not given			23	
COLLEGE TOTAL	636	100%	294	46%

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY**

**1999
TABLE 3
RESPONSE RATES
BY LENGTH OF SERVICE**

<u>Years employed at Penn College</u>	FullTime Staff/ Faculty	% of Total	Survey Responses	
			N	Response Rate
< 1	61	10%	20	33%
1 - 4	144	23%	53	37%
5 - 9	154	24%	70	45%
10 - 14	133	21%	61	46%
15+	144	23%	76	53%
not given			14	
COLLEGE TOTAL	636	100%	294	46%

**1999
TABLE 4
RESPONSE RATES
BY JOB CLASSIFICATION**

<u>Job Classification</u>	FullTime Staff/ Faculty	% of Total	Survey Responses	
			N	Response Rate
Faculty	236	37%	103	44%
APT (Administrative/Professional/Technical)	187	29%	119	64%
Classified	87	14%	55	63%
Service	126	20%	15	12%
not given			2	
COLLEGE TOTAL	636	100%	294	46%

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 5
RESPONSE RATES
BY ORGANIZATIONAL AREA

Organizational Area	FullTime Staff/ Faculty	% of Total	Survey Responses	
			N	Response Rate
Academic Affairs - Faculty				
Business/Computer Tech	30	4.7%	10	33%
Construction/Design Tech	40	6.3%	14	35%
Health Science	26	4.1%	19	73%
Hospitality	8	1.3%	6	75%
Industrial/Engineering Tech	32	5.0%	8	25%
Integrated Studies	55	8.6%	24	44%
Natural Resource Management	18	2.8%	7	39%
Transportation Tech	18	2.8%	7	39%
School not given				
Faculty sub-total	227	36%	95	42%
Academic Affairs - Staff				
Information Technology	50	7.9%	21	42%
Other Academic Affairs Staff	128	20.1%	56	44%
Academic Affairs sub-total	405	64%	172	42%
Administration	46	7.2%	16	35%
International/Business/Community Relations	27	4.2%	12	44%
Senior Vice President				
Development	3	0.5%	3	100%
Student Affairs	58	9.1%	47	81%
Other Staff (General Services, Human Resources, Planning/Research)	92	14.5%	27	29%
Sr VP sub-total	153	24%	77	50%
President's Office/not given	5	0.8%	17	
COLLEGE TOTAL	636	100%	294	46%

NOTE: Nine counselors and librarians have faculty rank; counselors are counted with Student Affairs; librarians are counted with Information Technology.

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY**

**1999
TABLE 6
OVERALL CLIMATE RATINGS
COMPARED BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS**

<u>Demographic Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
National PACE norm group	#N/A		3.55
Penn College response sample	294		3.69
Sex			
Female	126	54%	3.68
Male	108	46%	3.69
Race			
Non-white	5	2%	3.17
White	266	98%	3.71
Length of Service (years at Penn College)			
< 1	20	7%	4.02
1 - 4	53	19%	3.72
5 - 9	70	25%	3.61
10 - 14	61	22%	3.51
15+	76	27%	3.79
Classification			
Faculty	103	35%	3.65
APT	119	41%	3.74
Classified	55	19%	3.75
Service	15	5%	3.42
Preference of College mission			
Technical training school	5	2%	3.73
Technical college	39	15%	3.65
Community college	4	2%	3.10
"The college as we are today"	177	69%	3.77
Four-year college	31	12%	3.48

**PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY**

1999

**TABLE 6
OVERALL CLIMATE RATINGS
COMPARED BY DEMOGRAPHIC GROUPS**

<u>Demographic Group</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Mean Rating</u>
National PACE norm group	#N/A		3.55
Penn College response sample	294		3.69
<u>Organizational Area</u>			
Academic Affairs - Faculty			
Business/Computer Tech	10	3%	3.81
Construction/Design Tech	14	5%	3.73
Health Science	19	6%	3.66
Hospitality	6	2%	3.68
Industrial/Engineering Tech	8	3%	3.55
Integrated Studies	24	8%	3.37
Natural Resource Mgmt	7	2%	3.81
Transportation Tech	7	2%	3.88
<hr/>			
Faculty sub-total	95	32%	3.63
Academic Affairs - Staff			
Information Technology	21	7%	3.73
Other Academic Affairs Staff	56	19%	3.71
<hr/>			
Academic Affairs sub-total	172	59%	3.67
<hr/>			
Administration	16	5%	3.71
International/Business/Community Relations	12	4%	3.71
<hr/>			
Senior Vice President			
Development	3	1%	3.65
Student Affairs	47	16%	3.74
Other Staff (General Services, Human Resources, Planning/Research)	27	9%	3.84
<hr/>			
Sr VP sub-total	77	26%	3.71
<hr/>			
Organizational area not given	17	6%	3.50

NOTE: Nine counselors and librarians have faculty rank; counselors are counted with Student Affairs; librarians are counted with Information Technology.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 7
CLIMATE FACTOR RATINGS
PENN COLLEGE vs. NATIONAL NORMS

Item #s	Factor	Penn College			PACE Norms	
		Mean Rank	Range of item means Low - High	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Rank
1-10	Formal influence	3.66	4	3.17 - 4.11	3.61	3
11-19	Communication	3.57	6	3.38 - 3.94	3.34	6
20-27	Collaboration	3.54	7	3.42 - 3.76	3.50	4
28-35	Organizational structure	3.58	5	3.31 - 3.92	3.39	5
36-44	Work design/technology	3.87	2	3.40 - 4.34	3.74	1
45-55	Student focus	3.88	1	3.46 - 4.29	3.72	2
(a) 56-61	College mission/focus	3.69	3	3.27 - 4.08	#N/A	#N/A
OVERALL RATING		<u>3.69</u>		<u>3.17 - 4.34</u>	<u>3.55</u>	

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College; thus no normative ratings are available.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 8
CLIMATE FACTOR RATINGS
BY LENGTH OF SERVICE

Item #s Factor	<u>< 5 years</u>		<u>5 - 9 years</u>		<u>10 - 14 years</u>		<u>15 + years</u>		<u>Overall</u>	
	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank
1-10 Formal influence	3.88	3	3.57	4	3.39	5.5	3.76	4	3.66	4
11-19 Communication	3.77	5	3.45	6	3.34	7	3.66	6.5	3.57	6
20-27 Collaboration	3.63	7	3.42	7	3.39	5.5	3.66	6.5	3.54	7
28-35 Organizational structure	3.66	6	3.52	5	3.42	4	3.68	5	3.58	5
36-44 Work design/technology	3.96	1	3.81	2	3.75	1	3.90	2	3.87	2
45-55 Student focus	3.90	2	3.84	1	3.72	2	4.01	1	3.88	1
(a) 56-61 College mission/focus	3.81	4	3.72	3	3.61	3	3.81	3	3.69	3
OVERALL RATING	<u>3.80</u>		<u>3.61</u>		<u>3.51</u>		<u>3.79</u>		<u>3.69</u>	
Sample Size	73		70		61		76		280	

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 9
CLIMATE FACTOR RATINGS
BY JOB CLASSIFICATION

Item #s	Factor	Faculty		API		Classified		Service		Overall	
		Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size
1-10	Formal influence	3.64	3	3.76	3	3.61	7	3.21	7	3.66	4
11-19	Communication	3.52	6	3.61	6	3.65	5	3.33	6	3.57	6
20-27	Collaboration	3.38	7	3.66	5	3.64	6	3.40	3	3.54	7
28-35	Organizational structure	3.53	5	3.60	7	3.69	4	3.36	5	3.58	5
36-44	Work design/technology	3.91	1	3.87	2	3.88	3	3.39	4	3.87	2
45-55	Student focus	3.81	2	3.91	1	3.93	2	3.81	1	3.88	1
56-61	College mission/focus	3.57	4	3.75	4	3.93	1	3.75	2	3.69	3
OVERALL RATING		<u>3.65</u>		<u>3.74</u>		<u>3.75</u>		<u>3.42</u>		<u>3.69</u>	
Sample Size		101	119	53	15	288					

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 10
CLIMATE FACTOR RATINGS
BY ORGANIZATIONAL AREA

Item #s	Academic Affairs	Administration	Information Technology	Senior VP/(b)		Student Affairs	Overall	
				Development/Comm. Relations	Mean Rank			Mean Rank
1-10 Formal influence	3.68	3.59	3.60	5	3.69	4.5	3.66	4
11-19 Communication	3.54	3.46	3.56	7	3.68	6	3.57	6
20-27 Collaboration	3.46	3.35	3.59	6	3.65	7	3.54	7
28-35 Organizational structure	3.53	3.54	3.62	4	3.71	3	3.58	5
36-44 Work design/technology	3.89	3.86	3.85	3	3.90	1	3.87	2
45-55 Student focus	3.83	3.75	4.07	1	3.89	2	3.88	1
(a) 56-61 College mission/focus	3.60	3.79	3.90	2	3.69	4.5	3.69	3
OVERALL RATING	<u>3.67</u>	<u>3.60</u>	<u>3.73</u>		<u>3.72</u>	<u>3.74</u>	<u>3.69</u>	
Sample Size	151	16	21		42	45	275	

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College.

(b) Due to small response samples, offices of Development and International/Business/Community Relations were combined with the office of the Senior Vice President.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 11
CLIMATE FACTOR RATINGS
BY ACADEMIC SCHOOL (Faculty only)

Item #s Factor	Business/ Computer Tech		Construction/ Industrial Tech (b)		Health Science/ Hospitality (b)		Integrated Studies		Natural Re- source/Tran- sportation (b)		Overall	
	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size	Mean Rank	Sample Size
1-10 Formal influence	3.99	1	3.59	4	3.52	6	3.41	3	3.99	2	3.64	3
11-19 Communication	3.84	4	3.42	7	3.54	4.5	3.33	4	3.69	6	3.52	6
20-27 Collaboration	3.43	7	3.45	6	3.31	7	3.11	7	3.47	7	3.38	7
28-35 Organizational structure	3.59	6	3.65	3	3.54	4.5	3.19	6	3.84	5	3.53	5
36-44 Work design/technology	3.93	2	3.91	2	3.96	2	3.71	1	4.14	1	3.91	1
45-55 Student focus	3.92	3	3.94	1	4.01	1	3.43	2	3.89	4	3.81	2
(a) 56-61 College mission/focus	3.76	5	3.58	5	3.61	3	3.30	5	3.93	3	3.57	4
OVERALL RATING	<u>3.81</u>		<u>3.67</u>		<u>3.67</u>		<u>3.37</u>		<u>3.85</u>		<u>3.65</u>	
Sample Size	10		22		25		24		14		95	

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College.
(b) Due to small response samples, some academic schools were combined.

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999

TABLE 12
CLIMATE ITEM RATINGS
GROUPED BY CLIMATE FACTOR

Item #	Factor/ Item	Penn College		PACE Norms	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Formal influence - The extent to which...					
1	Actions of College reflect its mission	4.11	7		
2	My manager expresses confidence in my work	3.85	17.5		
3	My manager provides timely feedback re:my work	3.71	24.5		
4	I'm given opportunity to be creative in my work	3.89	14.5		
5	My manager emphasizes my personal development	3.54	39.5		
6	My manager seriously considers my ideas	3.69	27		
7	I have opportunity to appropriately express ideas	3.65	29		
8	My manager actively seeks my ideas	3.45	52		
9	I'm able to appropriately influence College direction	3.17	61		
10	College has positively motivated my performance	3.57	37		
1-10 Formal influence-overall		3.66	4	3.61	4
Communication - The extent to which...					
11	I receive info related to my work	3.58	34.5		
12	Info I receive is useful in my work	3.63	30		
13	Info I generate is shared w/others	3.58	34.5		
14	Positive work expectations are communicated to me	3.54	39.5		
15	Unacceptable behavior is identified/communicated	3.45	52		
16	Work outcomes are clarified for me	3.47	48.5		
17	Open/ethical communication is practiced here	3.38	58		
18	I receive adequate info re:important activities here	3.95	10		
19	Info is shared within the College	3.52	43		
11-19 Communication-overall		3.57	6	3.34	7
Collaboration - The extent to which...					
20	I have opportunity to work w/appropriate others	3.76	22		
21	Spirit of cooperation exists within my work team	3.57	37		
22	My work team uses problem-solving techniques	3.48	46.5		
23	Institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.42	55.5		
24	Spirit of cooperation exists at this College	3.43	54		
25	Spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.60	33		
26	There is opportunity to exchange ideas within work team	3.57	37		
27	My work team coordinates efforts w/appropriate others	3.50	44.5		
20-27 Collaboration-overall		3.54	7	3.50	5

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999

TABLE 12
CLIMATE ITEM RATINGS
GROUPED BY CLIMATE FACTOR

Item #	Factor/ Item	Penn College		PACE Norms	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Organizational structure - The extent to which...					
28	College-wide policies guide my work	3.62	31.5		
29	I receive timely feedback for my work	3.53	41.5		
30	I receive appropriate feedback for my work	3.48	46.5		
31	Amount of work I do is appropriate	3.53	41.5		
32	Variety of work I do is appropriate	3.82	20.5		
33	I'm able to organize my work day	3.92	11.5		
34	The College is appropriately organized	3.42	55.5		
35	Decisions are made at appropriate level here	3.31	59		
28-35 Organizational structure-overall		3.58	5	3.39	6
Work design/technology - The extent to which...					
36	Accuracy is expected of me in my job	4.21	5		
37	My skills are appropriate for my job	4.23	4		
38	My job is relevant to the College mission	4.34	1.5		
39	I'm responsible for meaningful work	4.34	1.5		
40	I have opportunity for advancement here	3.40	57		
41	My work is guided by clear administrative procedures	3.45	52		
42	My manager helps me improve my work	3.47	48.5		
43	I'm provided up-to-date technology in my job	3.82	20.5		
44	I'm provided training necessary to master my job	3.50	44.5		
36-44 Work design/technology-overall		3.87	2	3.74	1
Student Focus - The extent to which:					
45	Student needs are central to what we do	3.90	13		
46	Students receive an excellent education here	4.19	6		
47	Faculty meet needs of students	3.85	17.5		
48	Support services meet needs of students	3.98	9		
49	Administration meets needs of students	3.74	23		
50	Institution prepares students for career	4.29	3		
51	Institution prepares students for further learning	3.92	11.5		
52	Students are assisted w/personal development	3.62	31.5		
53	Students' competencies are enhanced	3.88	16		
54	Students are satisfied w/their education	3.89	14.5		
55	Ethnic/cultural diversity are important	3.46	50		
45-55 Student focus-overall		3.88	1	3.72	2

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY
PACE FACULTY/STAFF CLIMATE SURVEY

1999
TABLE 12
CLIMATE ITEM RATINGS
GROUPED BY CLIMATE FACTOR

Item #	Factor/ Item	Penn College		PACE Norms	
		Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
College mission/focus - The extent to which the College...					
56	Articulates its direction/focus to faculty/staff	3.70	26		
57	Articulates its direction/focus to external communities	3.71	24.5		
58	Responds to needs of local community	3.84	19		
59	Mission is appropriate	4.08	8		
60	Policies/procedures enhance its values/mission	3.68	28		
61	Governance represents/gives me voice in campus affairs	3.27	60		
(a) 56-61 College mission/focus-overall		3.69	3	#N/A	#N/A
OVERALL RATING		3.69		3.55	

(a) Items 56-61 were customized questions designed by Penn College; thus no normative ratings are available.

APPENDICES

PART VI – APPENDICES

Appendix A

PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Memorandum

TO: All Full-Time Employees

FROM: D. Gilmour, President

DATE: March 10, 1999

SUBJECT: Personal Assessment of College Environment (PACE) Survey

As many of you know, all Administrative, Professional and Technical (APT) employees are required to specify annual goals. One of my goals is to conduct a climate survey to determine our effectiveness as we begin to plan for our future.

With the change in leadership this past year, it would be useful to assess the impact of that change on the institutional climate. We need to first establish a benchmark and then repeat the assessment in two or three years to measure additional changes. This study will also serve as a useful lead-in to our Middle States Self-Study. In addition, we will be able to compare Penn College's institutional climate to that of other institutions nationwide.

The Office of Strategic Planning and Research staff has worked with me to identify the attached survey instrument. Steve Cunningham and his staff will distribute and collect the surveys, while the analysis and comparisons are done by the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness from North Carolina State University.

Please take the 10 minutes necessary to complete the standardized survey form and the additional questions specific to Penn College.

**Please return the completed survey no later than Monday,
March 29, 1999, to Strategic Planning and Research DIF 113 or drop it off in the
Klump Academic Center Room 110.**

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey. I look forward to sharing the data with you in August of 1999. Please feel free to contact Steve Cunningham or me if you have questions or desire additional information.

**Personal Assessment of the
College Environment
(PACE)**

**Institutional Effectiveness Model
by
George A. Baker III
and the NILIE Team at
North Carolina State University
College of Education & Psychology
300 Poe Hall, Box 7801
Raleigh NC 27695-7801**

This instrument may not be reproduced
or used without written permission.
Copyright 1997

Please Read Before Beginning Survey

Directions:

Please mark your responses on this sheet.



Throughout the survey, you will be asked to mark the response that most closely describes the environment at your institution. Thinking of your own personal experiences at your institution, mark the response on the five-point scale relating to the items in the various sections of the survey.

Complete all the items in this survey. However, if you do not understand an item, or feel that you do not possess enough information to answer it, leave the item blank. Use the Comments - section on the separate sheet to express your thoughts about items in this survey or the overall environment of your institution.

A separate set of 15 items (#56 - 70) specific to your institution may be included. Mark your responses to these items on side 2 of this sheet. Additional directions are given on the separate sheet.

Formal Influence

- 1. The extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission
- 2. The extent to which my manager expresses confidence in my work
- 3. The extent to which my manager provides timely feedback regarding my work
- 4. The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work
- 5. The extent to which my manager emphasizes my personal development
- 6. The extent to which my ideas are seriously considered by my manager
- 7. The extent to which I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums
- 8. The extent to which my ideas are actively sought by my manager
- 9. The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution
- 10. The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance

Communication

- 11. The extent to which I receive information related to my work
- 12. The extent to which the information I receive is useful in my work
- 13. The extent to which the information I generate is shared with others
- 14. The extent to which positive work expectations are communicated to me
- 15. The extent to which unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me
- 16. The extent to which work outcomes are clarified for me
- 17. The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution
- 18. The extent to which I receive adequate information regarding important activities at this institution
- 19. The extent to which information is shared within this institution

Collaboration

- 20. The extent to which I have an opportunity to work jointly with appropriate others at this institution
- 21. The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team
- 22. The extent to which my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques
- 23. The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques
- 24. The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution
- 25. The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department
- 26. The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team
- 27. The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals and teams

Very dissatisfied					
Dissatisfied					
Neither satisfied - Nor dissatisfied					
Satisfied					
Very satisfied					
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Confidential Survey

(Over)

Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE)
Side 2

Confidential Survey

Very dissatisfied					
Dissatisfied					
Neither satisfied - Nor dissatisfied					
Satisfied					
Very satisfied					

28. The extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work					
29. The extent to which I receive timely feedback for my work					
30. The extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work					
31. The extent to which the amount of work I do is appropriate					
32. The extent to which the variety of work I do is appropriate					
33. The extent to which I am able to organize my work day					
34. The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized					
35. The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution					
Work Design/Technology					
36. The extent to which accuracy is expected of me in my job					
37. The extent to which my skills are appropriate for my job					
38. The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission					
39. The extent to which I am responsible for meaningful work					
40. The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution					
41. The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes					
42. The extent to which my manager helps me to improve my work					
43. The extent to which I am provided up-to-date technology in my job					
44. The extent to which I am provided training necessary to master all aspects of my job					
Student Focus					
45. The extent to which student needs are central to what we do					
46. The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution					
47. The extent to which faculty meet the needs of the students					
48. The extent to which support services personnel meet the needs of the students					
49. The extent to which administrative personnel meet the needs of the students					
50. The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career					
51. The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning					
52. The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development					
53. The extent to which students' competencies are enhanced					
54. The extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experience at this institution					
55. The extent to which ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution					

College-Specific Items
 See separate Sheet.

Demographic Information

Very dissatisfied					
Dissatisfied					
Neither satisfied - Nor dissatisfied					
Satisfied					
Very satisfied					

56.					
57.					
58.					
59.					
60.					
61.					
62.					
63.					
64.					
65.					

- 71. How long have you worked at this institution?**
- Less than 1 year
 - 1 - 4 years
 - 5 - 9 years
 - 10 - 14 years
 - 15 or more years
- 72. What is your gender?**
- Female
 - Male
- 73. What is your race/ethnicity?**
- African-American
 - Alaskan Native/American Indian
 - Asian-American/Pacific Islander
 - Caucasian
 - Hispanic
- 74. What is your personnel classification?**
- Administrative
 - Administrative Support
 - Faculty
 - Technical/Campus Operations
- 75. In which division are you employed?**
- Academic Affairs
 - Administrative Affairs
 - Student Affairs
 - Business Affairs
 - Community Affairs

College-Specific Demographic Information

66.							
67.							
68.							

Pennsylvania College of Technology

**Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE)
College-Specific Items**

In addition to the items on the survey, the college would appreciate your response to the following items. Please mark your responses on the blue questionnaire opposite the corresponding survey items.

- 56. The extent to which the institution articulates its direction and focus to faculty and staff
- 57. The extent to which the institution articulates its direction and focus to external communities
- 58. The extent to which the institution currently responds to the needs of the local community
- 59. The extent to which the mission of the institution is appropriate for the College
- 60. The extent to which the College's current policies and procedures enhance its values and mission
- 61. The extent to which Governance gives me a voice or represents me in campus affairs
- 62. <skip this item>
- 63. <skip this item>
- 64. <skip this item>
- 65. <skip this item>

Please continue to item number 66 and mark your response on the blue questionnaire opposite the circle that corresponds to your response.

i.e.: ● ● ● ● ● ● ●
 A B C D E F G

- 66. What is your employee classification?
 - A) APT (Administrative/Professional Technical)
 - B) Classified
 - C) Faculty
 - D) Service

- 67. In what organizational area do you work?
 - A) Academic Affairs
 - B) Administration
 - C) Development
 - D) Information Technology
 - E) International/Business/Community Relations
 - F) Senior VP (General Services/Human Resources/Strategic Planning & Research)
 - G) Student Services

**Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE)
College-Specific Items
(continued)**

68. If faculty, in which academic school do you work (see #69 for additional choices)?

- A) Business/Computer Technologies
- B) Health Sciences
- C) Hospitality
- D) Integrated Studies
- E) None of the above

69. If faculty, in which academic school do you work (see #68 for additional choices)?

- A) Construction/Design Technologies
- B) Industrial/Engineering Technologies
- C) Natural Resource Management
- D) Transportation Technologies
- E) None of the above

70. If it were your decision, what type of institution would Penn College primarily function as (choose only one)?

- A) Community College
- B) 4-Year College
- C) Technical College
- D) Technical Training School
- E) The College as we are today

Please complete items 71 to 73; skip items 74 and 75.

Comments Section

Please provide comments that you feel may be important to the overall assessment of your college environment. This is a confidential survey.

End of Survey - Thank you!



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").