



National Initiative for Leadership & Institutional Effectiveness

---

# **Bergen Community College Paramus, New Jersey**

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

by

**Antonio Bush & Jingjing Zhang**

**The National Initiative for Leadership  
& Institutional Effectiveness**

**North Carolina State University**

**November 2011**

National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness

Audrey Jaeger, PhD, Co-executive Director  
Paul Umbach, PhD, Co-executive Director  
Dawn Crotty, Executive Assistant  
Jingjing Zhang, Director of Research  
Antonio Bush, Researcher  
Kyle Verbosh, Researcher

Phone: 919-515-8567  
919-515-6289  
Fax: 919-515-6305  
Web: <http://ced.ncsu.edu/ahe/nilie>


College of Education  
North Carolina State University  
300 Poe Hall, Box 7801  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7801

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In November 2011, the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey was administered to 1451 employees at Bergen Community College (BCC). Of those 1451 employees, 463 (31.9%) completed and returned the instrument for analysis. The purpose of the survey was to obtain the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist BCC in promoting more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators. Researchers at the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) and representatives of BCC collaborated to administer a survey that would capture the opinions of personnel throughout the college.

In the PACE model, the leadership of an institution motivates the Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork, and Student Focus climate factors toward an outcome of student success and institutional effectiveness.

**Figure 1.** The PACE Model



NILIE has synthesized from the literature four leadership or organizational systems ranging from coercive to collaborative. According to Likert (1967), the Collaborative System, which he termed System 4, generally produced better results in terms of productivity, job satisfaction, communication, and overall organizational climate. The other systems were Consultative (System 3), Competitive (System 2) and Coercive (System 1). In agreement with Likert, NILIE has concluded that Collaborative (System 4) is the climate to be sought as opposed to existing naturally in the environment. Likert discovered that most of the organizations he studied functioned at the Competitive or Consultative levels. This has been NILIE's experience as well, with most college climates falling into the Consultative system across the four factors of the climate instrument.

Of the more than 120 studies completed by NILIE, few institutions have been found to achieve a fully Collaborative (System 4) environment, although scores in some categories may fall in this range for some classifications of employees. Thus, if the Collaborative System is the ideal, then this environment is the one to be sought through planning, collaboration, and organizational development.

Employees completed a 46-item PACE instrument organized into four climate factors as follows: Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork, and Student Focus. They also completed a Customized section designed specifically for Bergen Community College. Respondents were asked to rate the four factors on a five-point Likert-type scale. The instrument was specifically designed to compare the existing climate at BCC to a range of four managerial systems found to exist in colleges and to a Norm Base of 60 community colleges across North America. The information generated from the instrument has been developed into a research report that can be used for planning and decision-making in order to improve the existing college climate.

The PACE instrument administered at BCC included 56 total items. Respondents were asked to rate items on a five-point satisfaction scale from a low of “1” to a high of “5.” Of the 56 items, none fell within the least favorable category identified as the Coercive range (rated between 1 and 2) or the Competitive range (rated between 2 and 3). Fifty fell within the Consultative range (rated between 3 and 4), and six composite ratings fell within the Collaborative range (rated between 4 and 5).

At BCC, the overall results from the PACE instrument indicate a healthy campus climate, yielding an overall 3.66 mean score or high Consultative system. The Student Focus category received the highest mean score (3.99), whereas the Supervisory Relationship category received the lowest mean score (3.40). When respondents were classified according to Personnel Classification at BCC, the composite ratings were as follows: Administration (3.74), Faculty (3.76), Other Professionals (3.42), and Support Staff (3.43).

Of the 46 standard PACE questions, the top mean scores have been identified at Bergen Community College.

- The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission, 4.38 (#8)
- The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution, 4.27 (#18)
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning, 4.11 (#37)
- The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution, 4.10 (#31)
- The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work, 4.08 (#2)
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career, 4.04 (#35)
- The extent to which the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace, 3.96 (#5)
- The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work, 3.93 (#39)
- The extent to which student needs are central to what we do, 3.92 (#7)
- The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development, 3.91 (#40)

Of the 46 standard PACE questions, the mean scores have been identified as areas in need of improvement at Bergen Community College.

- The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution, 3.03 (#15)
- The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution, 3.07 (#38)
- The extent to which information is shared within this institution, 3.17 (#10)
- The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution , 3.20 (#16)
- The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized, 3.21 (#32)
- The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution, 3.23 (#25)
- The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution, 3.23 (#4)
- The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques, 3.24 (#11)
- The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance, 3.39 (#22)
- The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes, 3.41 (#44)

Respondents were also given an opportunity to provide comments about the most favorable aspects and the least favorable aspects of BCC. The responses provide insight and anecdotal evidence that support the survey questions.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
Table of Contents .....	4
List of Tables .....	5
List of Figures .....	6
Leadership Research .....	7
Method .....	11
Population .....	11
Instrumentation .....	11
Reliability and Validity.....	12
Data Analysis .....	13
Respondent Characteristics.....	13
Comparative Analysis: Overall.....	16
Comparative Analysis: Personnel Classification .....	20
Comparative Analysis: Demographic Classifications .....	28
Comparative Analysis: Norm Base.....	36
Qualitative Analysis.....	40
Conclusion .....	52
References.....	54

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. NILIE Four Systems Model.....	9
Table 2. Alpha Coefficients by Climate Category.....	12
Table 3. Response by Self-Selected Personnel Classification.....	13
Table 4. Proportion of Responses Across Demographic Classifications.....	15
Table 5. Bergen Community College Climate as Rated by All Employees.....	17
Table 6. Comparative Mean Response: Institutional Structure.....	19
Table 7. Comparative Mean Responses: Supervisory Relationships.....	20
Table 8. Comparative Mean Responses: Teamwork.....	20
Table 9. Comparative Mean Responses: Student Focus.....	21
Table 10. Comparative Mean Responses: Customized.....	22
Table 11. Mean Climate Scores as Rated by Personnel Classifications.....	24
Table 12. Priorities for Change: Administration (President's Cabinet; Chief Officer; Dean; Director; Manager).....	30
Table 13. Priorities for Change: Faculty (Full-time; Lecturer; Adjunct).....	31
Table 14. Priorities for Change: Other Professionals (Library; Counselor; Professional/Technical Assistants; all other Professional Staff).....	32
Table 15. Priorities for Change: Support Staff (Clerical/Secretarial Staff; Service/maintenance; Public Safety).....	33
Table 16. Mean Climate Factor Scores as Rated by Demographic Classification.....	34
Table 17. BCC Climate Compared to the 2009 Administration of the PACE Survey and the NILIE Norm Base.....	36
Table 18. Institutional Structure Mean Scores Compared to the Norm Base.....	37
Table 19. Supervisory Relationships Mean Scores Compared to the Norm Base.....	38
Table 20. Teamwork Mean Scores Compared to the Norm Base.....	38
Table 21. Student Focus Mean Scores Compared to the Norm Base.....	39
Table 22. Most Favorable Comments.....	41
Table 23. Least Favorable Comments.....	46

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. The PACE Model .....	1
Figure 2. Proportion of Total Responses by Personnel Classification.....	14
Figure 3. BCC Climate as Rated by All Employees.....	18
Figure 4. Mean Climate Scores as Rated by Personnel Classification .....	23
Figure 5. Mean Scores of the Institutional Structure Climate Factor .....	25
Figure 6. Mean Scores of the Supervisory Relationships Climate Factor .....	26
Figure 7. Mean Scores of the Teamwork Climate Factor .....	27
Figure 8. Mean Scores of the Student Focus Climate Factor .....	28
Figure 9. Mean Scores of the Customized Climate Factor .....	29
Figure 10. BCC Climate Compared with the 2009 Administration of the PACE Survey and the NILIE PACE Norm Base.....	36
Figure 11. BCC Comment Response Rate.....	40

# LEADERSHIP RESEARCH

The term culture refers to a total communication and behavioral pattern within an organization. Yukl (2002) defines organizational culture as “the shared values and beliefs of members about the activities of the organization and interpersonal relationships” (p. 108). Schein (2004) observes that culture “points us to phenomena that are below the surface, that are powerful in their impact but invisible and to a considerable degree unconscious. In that sense culture is to a group what personality is to an individual” (p. 8). Culture as a concept, then, is deeply embedded in an organization and relatively difficult to change; yet it has real day-to-day consequences in the life of the organization. According to Baker and Associates (1992), culture is manifest through symbols, rituals, and behavioral norms, and new members of an organization need to be socialized in the culture in order for the whole to function effectively.

Climate refers to the prevailing condition that affects satisfaction (e.g., morale and feelings) and productivity (e.g., task completion or goal attainment) at a particular point in time. Essentially then, climate is a subset of an organization’s culture, emerging from the assumptions made about the underlying value system and finding expression through members’ attitudes and actions (Baker & Associates, 1992).

The way that various individuals behave in an organization influences the climate that exists within that organization. If individuals perceive accepted patterns of behavior as motivating and rewarding their performance, they tend to see a positive environment. Conversely, if they experience patterns of behavior that are self-serving, autocratic, or punishing, then they see a negative climate. The importance of these elements as determiners of quality and productivity and the degree of satisfaction that employees receive from the performance of their jobs have been well documented in the research literature for more than 40 years (Baker & Associates, 1992).

NILIE’s present research examines the value of delegating and empowering others within the organization through an effective management and leadership process. Yukl (2002) defined leadership as “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives” (p. 7). The concept of leadership has been studied for many years in a variety of work settings, and there is no one theory of management and leadership that is universally accepted (Baker & Associates, 1992). However, organizational research conducted to date shows a strong relationship between leadership processes and other aspects of the organizational culture. Intensive efforts to conceptualize and measure organizational climate began in the 1960s with Rensis Likert’s work at the University of Michigan. A framework of measuring organizational climate was developed by Likert (1967) and has been adapted by others, including McClelland and Atkinson, as reported in Baker and Glass (1993).

The first adaptation of Likert’s climate concepts research to higher education organizations was employed at the various campuses of Miami-Dade Community College, Florida, in 1986. A modified version of the Likert profile of organizations was used in a case study of Miami-Dade Community College and reported by Roueche and Baker (1987).

Results of the Miami-Dade study indicated that Likert's four-system theory worked well when applied to a higher education setting. It showed promise not only for measuring climate and responses to leadership style but also for articulating ways both leadership effectiveness and organizational climate could be improved within the institution. Since the Miami-Dade research project, more than 120 institutions have participated in climate studies conducted by NILIE at North Carolina State University. Various versions of the PACE instrument were field-tested through NILIE's efforts, and several doctoral dissertations.

From Likert's original work and research methods, NILIE identified four leadership models and organizational systems ranging from Coercion to Collaboration. The Collaborative System, referred to as System 4, is generally seen as the ideal climate to be achieved, since it appears to produce better results in terms of productivity, job satisfaction, communication, and overall organizational effectiveness (Likert, 1967). The various NILIE research studies have verified that the Collaborative System is the climate to be sought. NILIE's research supports the conclusion that most organizations function between the Competitive (System 2) and Consultative (System 3) levels across the four climate factors of the instrument (i.e., Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork, and Student Focus).

Coercion represents the least desirable climate and constitutes a structured, task-oriented, and highly authoritative leadership management style. This leadership style assumes that followers are inherently lazy, and to make them productive, the manager must keep after them constantly. Interestingly, a few employees in almost all organizations evaluated by NILIE hold this view of the organizational climate. However, as a rule, their numbers are too few to have much effect on the overall institutional averages.

In contrast, a Collaborative model is characterized by leadership behaviors that are change-oriented, where appropriate decisions have been delegated to organizational teams, and leaders seek to achieve trust and confidence in the followers. The followers reciprocate with positive views of the leaders. This model is based on the assumption that work is a source of satisfaction and will be performed voluntarily with self-direction and self-control because people have a basic need to achieve and be productive. It also assumes that the nature of work calls for people to come together in teams and groups in order to accomplish complex tasks. This leadership environment is particularly descriptive of the climate necessary for productivity in a higher education environment, especially in the face of present and near future challenges such as new technologies, demands for accountability and the desire to accurately measure learning outcomes.

As the perceptions of the staff, faculty, and administrators approach the characteristics of the Collaborative environment, better results are achieved in terms of productivity and cost management. Employees are absent from work less often and tend to remain employed in the organization for a longer period of time. The Collaborative model also produces a better organizational climate characterized by excellent communication, higher peer-group loyalty, high confidence and trust, and favorable attitudes toward supervisors (Likert, 1967). In addition, various researchers (Blanchard, 1985; Stewart, 1982; Yukl, 2002) suggest that adapting leadership styles to fit particular situations according to the employees' characteristics and developmental stages and other intervening variables may be appropriate for enhancing productivity. Table 1 is a model of NILIE's four-systems framework based on Likert's original work and modified through NILIE's research conducted between 1992 and the present.

**Table 1.** NILIE Four Systems Model

System 1	System 2	System 3	System 4
Coercive	Competitive	Consultative	Collaborative
Leaders are seen as having no confidence or trust in employees and seldom involve them in any aspect of the decision-making process.	Leaders are seen as having condescending confidence and trust in employees. Employees are occasionally involved in some aspects of the decision-making process.	Leaders are seen as having substantial but not complete confidence and trust in employees. Employees are significantly involved in the decision-making process.	Leaders are seen as having demonstrated confidence and trust in employees. Employees are involved in appropriate aspects of the decision-making process.
Decisions are made at the top and issued downward.	Some decision-making processes take place in the lower levels, but control is at the top.	More decisions are made at the lower levels, and leaders consult with followers regarding decisions.	Decision making is widely dispersed throughout the organization and is well integrated across levels.
Lower levels in the organization oppose the goals established by the upper levels.	Lower levels in the organization cooperate in accomplishing selected goals of the organization.	Lower levels in the organization begin to deal more with morale and exercise cooperation toward accomplishment of goals.	Collaboration is employed throughout the organization.
Influence primarily takes place through fear and punishment.	Some influence is experienced through the rewards process and some through fear and punishment.	Influence is through the rewards process. Occasional punishment and some collaboration occur.	Employees are influenced through participation and involvement in developing economic rewards, setting goals, improving methods, and appraising progress toward goals.

In addition to Likert, other researchers have discovered a strong relationship between the climate of an organization and the leadership styles of the managers and leaders in the organization.

Astin and Astin (2000) note that the purposes of leadership are based in these values:

- To create a supportive environment where people can grow, thrive, and live in peace with one another;
- To promote harmony with nature and thereby provide sustainability for future generations; and
- To create communities of reciprocal care and shared responsibility where every person matters and each person’s welfare and dignity is respected and supported (p. 11).

Studies of leadership effectiveness abound in the literature. Managers and leaders who plan change strategies for their organizations based on the results of a NILIE climate survey are encouraged to review theories and concepts, such as those listed below, when planning for the future.

- The path-goal theory of House (1971, 1996) in which leader behavior is expressed in terms of the leader's influence in clarifying paths or routes followers travel toward work achievement and personal goal attainment.
- The Vroom/Yetton model for decision procedures used by leaders in which the selected procedure affects the quality of the decision and the level of acceptance by people who are expected to implement the decision (Vroom & Yetton, 1973 as discussed in Yukl, 2002).
- Situational leadership theories (see Northouse, 2004; Yukl, 2002).
- Transformational leadership theory (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Astin & Astin, 2000).
- Emotional intelligence theories (Goleman, 1995; Goleman, McKee & Boyatzis, 2002)

In the context of the modern community college, there is much interest in organizational climate studies and their relation to current thinking about leadership. The times require different assumptions regarding leader-follower relations and the choice of appropriate leadership strategies that lead to achievement of organizational goals. This report may help Bergen Community College understand and improve the overall climate by examining perceptions and estimates of quality and excellence across personnel groups. This report may also provide benchmarks and empirical data that can be systematically integrated into effective planning models and change strategies for Bergen Community College.

# METHOD

## Population

In November 2011, the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) survey was administered to the staff, faculty, and administrators of Bergen Community College. Of the 1451 employees administered the instrument, 463 (31.9%) completed and returned the instrument for analysis. Of those 463 employees, 226 respondents (48.8%) completed the open-ended comments section. The purpose of the survey was to obtain the perceptions of personnel concerning the college climate and to provide data to assist BCC in promoting more open and constructive communication among faculty, staff, and administrators. Researchers at the National Initiative for Leadership and Institutional Effectiveness (NILIE) and the Center for Institutional Effectiveness of BCC collaborated to administer a survey that would capture the opinions of personnel throughout the college.

Employees of BCC were invited to participate in the survey through an email that contained the survey link and instructions. Follow-up emails were sent during the response period to encourage participation. The survey was up for one month. Completed surveys were submitted online and the data compiled by NILIE. The data were analyzed using the statistical package SAS, version 9.1.

## Instrumentation

The PACE instrument is divided into four climate factors: Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork, and Student Focus. A Customized section developed by Bergen Community College was also included in the administration of the instrument. A total of 56 items were included in the PACE survey, as well as a series of questions ascertaining the demographic status of respondents.

Respondents were asked to rate the various climate factors through their specific statements on a five-point scale from a low of "1" to a high of "5." The mean scores for all items were obtained and compared. Items with lower scores were considered to be high priority issues for the institution. In this way, the areas in need of improvement were ranked in order of priority, thereby assisting in the process of developing plans to improve the overall performance of the institution.

After completing the standard survey items, respondents were given an opportunity to provide comments about the most favorable aspects of BCC and the least favorable aspects. The responses provide insight and anecdotal evidence to support the survey questions.

## Reliability and Validity

In previous studies, the overall PACE instrument has shown a coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of 0.98. Cronbach's alpha coefficient provides an internal estimate of the instrument's reliability. The high coefficient means that participants responded the same way to similar items. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of internal consistency from July 2009 to July 2011 are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Alpha Coefficients by Climate Category for PACEs Completed from July 2009 to July 2011 (n=14,635)

<b>Climate Category</b>	<b>Alpha Coefficient</b>
Institutional Structure	0.95
Supervisory Relationships	0.95
Teamwork	0.93
Student Focus	0.91
<b>Overall (1-46)</b>	<b>0.98</b>

Establishing instrument validity is a fundamental component of ensuring the research effort is assessing the intended phenomenon. To that end, NILIE has worked hard to demonstrate the validity of the PACE instrument through both content and construct validity. Content validity has been established through a rigorous review of the instrument's questions by scholars and professionals in higher education to ensure that the instrument's items capture the essential aspects of institutional effectiveness.

Building on this foundation of content validity, the PACE instrument has been thoroughly tested to ensure construct (climate factors) validity through two separate factor analysis studies (Tiu, 2001; Caison, 2005). Factor analysis is a quantitative technique for determining the intercorrelations between the various items of an instrument. These intercorrelations confirm the underlying relationships between the variables and allow the researcher to determine that the instrument is functioning properly to assess the intended constructs. To ensure the continued validity of the PACE instrument, the instrument is routinely evaluated for both content and construct validity. The recent revision of the PACE instrument reflects the findings of Tiu and Caison.

## DATA ANALYSIS

Data were analyzed in five ways. First, a descriptive analysis of the respondents' demographics is presented, followed by an overall analysis of the item and climate factor means and standard deviations. Where appropriate, comparisons are made with matching data from BCC's 2009 PACE by conducting *t*-tests to identify items significantly different from the previous PACE administration. Similar analyses were applied to the items and climate factors by Personnel Classification and generated priorities for change for each Personnel Classification. Also, comparative analyses of factor means by demographic variables were conducted. The item and factor means of this PACE were correspondingly compared with the NILIE Norm Base, with significant differences between means again being identified through *t*-tests. Finally, a qualitative analysis was conducted on the open-ended comments provided by the survey respondents.


### Respondent Characteristics

Of the 1451 BCC employees administered the survey, 463 (31.9%) completed the PACE survey. Survey respondents classified themselves into Personnel Classifications. Refer to Table 3 and Figure 2. Caution should be used when making inferences from the data, particularly for subgroups with return rates of less than 60%.

**Table 3.** Response by Self-Selected Personnel Classification

<b>Personnel Classification</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Surveys Returned for Analysis</b>	<b>Percent of Population Represented</b>
Administration (President's Cabinet; Chief Officer; Dean; Director; Manager)	42	35	83.3%
Faculty (Full-time; Lecturer; Adjunct)	1043	279	26.7%
Other Professionals (Library; Counselor; Professional/Technical Assistants; all other Professional Staff)	144	70	48.6%
Support Staff (Clerical/Secretarial Staff; Service/Maintenance; Public Safety)	222	56	25.2%
Did not respond		23	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1451</b>	<b>463</b>	<b>31.9%</b>

**Figure 2.** Proportion of Total Responses by Personnel Classification



23 individuals did not respond to the Personnel Classification demographic variable.

Table 4 reports the number of respondents across the different demographic classifications and the percentage of the overall responses that each group represents. This table also compares the results of the previous administration of the PACE survey with this latest administration.

**Table 4.** Proportion of Responses Across Demographic Classifications

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>2009 # of Responses</b>	<b>2009 % of Responses</b>	<b>2011 # of Responses</b>	<b>2011 % of Responses</b>
<b>What is your personnel classification:</b>				
Administration (President's Cabinet; Chief Officer; Dean; Director; Manager)	44	11.5%	35	7.5%
Faculty (Full-time; Lecturer; Adjunct)	190	49.5%	279	60.3%
Other Professionals (Library; Counselor; Professional/Technical Assistants; all other Professional Staff)	78	20.3%	70	15.1%
Support Staff (Clerical/Secretarial Staff; Service/Maintenance; Public Safety)	69	18.0%	56	12.1%
Did not respond	3	0.8%	23	5.0%
<b>Your status at this institution is:</b>				
Full-time	320	83.3%	307	66.3%
Part-time	58	15.1%	132	28.5%
Did not respond	6	1.6%	24	5.2%
<b>Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you:</b>				
Hispanic or Latino, of any race	26	6.8%	39	8.4%
American Indian or Alaska Native, not Hispanic or Latino	0	0.0%	1	0.2%
Asian, not Hispanic or Latino	10	2.6%	24	5.2%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, not Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	1	0.2%
Black, not Hispanic or Latino	16	4.2%	24	5.2%
White, not Hispanic or Latino	289	75.3%	318	68.7%
Other	32	8.3%	N/A	N/A
Two or more races, not Hispanic or Latino	N/A	N/A	20	4.3%
Did not respond	11	2.9%	38	8.2%
<b>How long have you worked at the College:</b>				
Less than 5 years	115	29.9%	152	32.8%
5-10 years	89	23.2%	112	24.2%
11-20 years	92	24.0%	95	20.5%
21 or more years	78	20.3%	82	17.7%
Did not respond	10	2.6%	22	4.8%

N/A = Option was not included in the 2009 administration

**Table 4.** Continued.

<b>Demographic Variable</b>	<b>2009 # of Responses</b>	<b>2009 % of Responses</b>	<b>2011 # of Responses</b>	<b>2011 % of Responses</b>
<b>If you are a faculty member, what is your current rank:</b>				
Professor	47	23.0%	40	8.6%
Associate Professor	31	15.2%	42	9.1%
Assistant Professor	54	26.5%	45	9.7%
Lecturer	14	6.9%	30	6.5%
Instructor	16	7.8%	22	4.8%
Adjunct/Part-time Faculty	42	20.6%	121	26.1%
Did not respond	0	0.0%	163	35.2%

## Comparative Analysis: Overall

The results from the PACE survey indicate that personnel perceive the composite climate at BCC to fall toward the middle-range of the Consultative management style. The scale range describes the four systems of management style defined by Likert and adapted by Baker and the NILIE team in their previous in-depth case studies. The four systems are Coercive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 1.0 and 2.0), Competitive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 2.0 and 3.0), Consultative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 3.0 and 4.0), and Collaborative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 4.0 and 5.0). As previously stated, the Collaborative management style is related to greater productivity, group decision making, and the establishment of higher performance goals when compared to the other three styles. Thus, the Collaborative system is a system to be sought through planning and organizational learning.


As indicated in Table 5, the Student Focus climate factor received the highest composite rating (3.99), which represented a upper-range Consultative management environment. The Supervisory Relationship climate factor received the lowest mean score (3.40) within the middle area of the Consultative management area. Overall, employees rated the management style in the middle range of the Consultative management area. (See also Figure 3). When compared to the revised 2009 BCC mean scores, the BCC 2011 mean scores increased.

**Table 5.** Bergen Community College Climate as Rated by All Employees

<b>Factor</b>	<b>2009 BCC</b>	<b>2011 BCC</b>
Institutional Structure	3.53	3.68
Supervisory Relationships	3.12	3.40
Teamwork	3.53	3.67
Student Focus	3.84	3.99
Custom	3.23	3.67
<b>Overall*</b>	3.47	3.66

\* Overall does not include the customized section developed specifically for BCC.

**Figure 3.** Bergen Community College Climate as Rated by All Employees Combined Using Composite Averages



In reviewing each of the items separately, the data shows that of the 56 mean scores, no items fell within the Coercive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 1.0 and 2.0) or the Competitive management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 2.0 and 3.0). Fifty fell within a Consultative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 3.0 and 4.0), and six fell within a Collaborative management style (i.e., a mean score rating between 4.0 and 5.0).

The preponderance of Consultative (n=50) scores indicates that the institution has a relatively high level of perceived productivity and satisfaction. Overall results from the survey yielded a mean institutional climate score of 3.66 as indicated in Figure 3.

Tables 6 through 10 reports the mean scores of all personnel for each of the 56 items included in the survey instrument. The mean scores and standard deviations presented in this table estimate what the personnel participating in the study at BCC perceive the climate to be at this particular time in the institution's development. The standard deviation (SD) demonstrates the variation in responses to a given question.

\* Overall does not include the customized section developed specifically for BCC.

**Table 6.** Comparative Mean Responses: Institutional Structure

<b>Institutional Structure</b>	<b>2009 Mean (SD)</b>	<b>2011 Mean (SD)</b>
1 The extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission	3.52 (1.03)	3.72 (0.93)*
4 The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	2.75 (1.24)	3.23 (1.19)*
5 The extent to which the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace	3.77 (1.04)	3.96 (0.99)*
6 The extent to which administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students	3.33 (1.21)	3.69 (1.12)*
10 The extent to which information is shared within the institution	2.77 (1.30)	3.17 (1.24)*
11 The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	2.93 (1.14)	3.24 (1.08)*
15 The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	2.92 (1.25)	3.03 (1.18)
16 The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	2.85 (1.26)	3.20 (1.29)*
22 The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.12 (1.32)	3.39 (1.27)*
25 The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	2.82 (1.29)	3.23 (1.23)*
29 The extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work	3.25 (1.03)	3.53 (1.07)*
32 The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	2.88 (1.23)	3.21 (1.21)*
38 The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	3.03 (1.34)	3.07 (1.34)
41 The extent to which I receive adequate information regarding important activities at this institution	3.58 (1.19)	3.66 (1.06)
44 The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	3.07 (1.25)	3.41 (1.16)*
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.53 (0.98)</b>	<b>3.68 (0.94)*</b>

\* T-test results indicate a significant difference between the 2009 mean and the 2011 mean ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

**Table 7.** Comparative Mean Responses: Supervisory Relationships

<b>Supervisory Relationships</b>		<b>2009 Mean (SD)</b>	<b>2011 Mean (SD)</b>
2	The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work	3.94 (1.22)	4.08 (1.11)
9	The extent to which my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of everyone	3.72 (1.33)	3.89 (1.28)
12	The extent to which positive work expectations are communicated to me	3.31 (1.24)	3.53 (1.16)*
13	The extent to which unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me	3.30 (1.11)	3.54 (1.05)*
20	The extent to which I receive timely feedback for my work	3.40 (1.16)	3.56 (1.18)
21	The extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work	3.42 (1.18)	3.64 (1.12)*
26	The extent to which my supervisor actively seeks my ideas	3.55 (1.30)	3.60 (1.27)
27	The extent to which my supervisor seriously considers my ideas	3.59 (1.28)	3.69 (1.25)
30	The extent to which work outcomes are clarified for me	3.27 (1.10)	3.48 (1.10)*
34	The extent to which my supervisor helps me to improve my work	3.53 (1.23)	3.60 (1.23)
39	The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work	3.76 (1.20)	3.93 (1.13)*
45	The extent to which I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums	3.38 (1.21)	3.54 (1.16)
46	The extent to which professional development and training opportunities are available	3.59 (1.18)	3.68 (1.10)
<b>Mean Total</b>		<b>3.12 (0.93)</b>	<b>3.40 (0.92)*</b>

**Table 8.** Comparative Mean Responses: Teamwork

<b>Teamwork</b>		<b>2009 Mean (SD)</b>	<b>2011 Mean (SD)</b>
3	The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team	3.55 (1.31)	3.76 (1.25)*
14	The extent to which my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques	3.48 (1.13)	3.68 (1.13)*
24	The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team	3.55 (1.22)	3.63 (1.20)
33	The extent to which my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs	3.54 (1.25)	3.68 (1.24)
36	The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals	3.57 (1.08)	3.73 (1.03)*
43	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.56 (1.35)	3.62 (1.27)
<b>Mean Total</b>		<b>3.53 (1.07)</b>	<b>3.67 (1.08)</b>

\* T-test results indicate a significant difference between the 2009 mean and the 2011 mean ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

**Table 9.** Comparative Mean Responses: Student Focus

<b>Student Focus</b>	<b>2009 Mean (SD)</b>	<b>2011 Mean (SD)</b>
7 The extent to which student needs are central to what we do	3.44 (1.18)	3.92 (1.07)*
8 The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission	4.11 (1.06)	4.38 (0.86)*
17 The extent to which faculty meet the needs of students	3.93 (0.86)	3.86 (0.95)
18 The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution	4.14 (0.79)	4.27 (0.77)*
19 The extent to which students' competencies are enhanced	3.75 (0.84)	3.88 (0.93)*
23 The extent to which non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of the students	3.66 (1.07)	3.73 (1.05)
28 The extent to which classified personnel meet the needs of the students	3.45 (0.98)	3.60 (1.03)
31 The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution	4.09 (0.83)	4.10 (0.85)
35 The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career	3.93 (0.86)	4.04 (0.85)
37 The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning	4.00 (0.82)	4.11 (0.83)
40 The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development	3.71 (0.90)	3.91 (0.89)*
42 The extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experience at this institution	3.89 (0.77)	3.85 (0.80)
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.84 (0.65)</b>	<b>3.99 (0.69)*</b>
<b>Overall</b>	<b>3.47 (0.78)</b>	<b>3.66 (0.81)*</b>

\* T-test results indicate a significant difference between the 2009 mean and the 2011 mean ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

**Table 10.** Comparative Mean Responses: Customized

<b>Customized</b>	<b>2009 Mean (SD)</b>	<b>2011 Mean (SD)</b>
47 The extent to which faculty and staff at this institution understand the needs of students requiring developmental education	N/A	3.84 (0.96)*
48 The extent to which the faculty across the institution is committed to meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	N/A	3.79 (0.98)*
49 The extent to which the students completing developmental education courses are ready for college-level courses	N/A	3.51 (1.09)*
50 The extent to which non-teaching professional staff is meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	N/A	3.65 (0.96)*
51 The extent to which student services personnel is providing adequate support to students enrolled in developmental education courses	N/A	3.63 (1.02)
52 The extent to which students receive an excellent developmental education at this institution	N/A	3.75 (0.99)
53 The extent to which this institution effectively prepares students in developmental education to achieve their academic goals	N/A	3.69 (1.04)*
54 The extent to which students in developmental education appear to be satisfied with their educational experience	N/A	3.69 (0.98)*
55 The extent to which faculty and staff collaborate to enhance the experience of students in development education	N/A	3.67 (1.07)*
56 The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them	N/A	3.52 (1.08)*
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>3.67 (0.86)</b>


N/A – Question was not included in the 2009 administration.

## Comparative Analysis: Personnel Classification

Figure 4 reports composite ratings according to the four climate factors and the customized questions for employees in Personnel Classifications. In general, the Faculty rated the four normative factors most favorable (3.76), whereas the Other Professionals rated the four normative factors least favorable (3.42). See also Table 11.

Figures 5 through 9 show the ratings of each employee group for each of the 56 climate items. The data summary for each figure precedes the corresponding figure. This information provides a closer look at the institutional climate ratings and should be examined carefully when prioritizing areas for change among the employee groups.

**Figure 4.** Mean Climate Scores as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College.



\* The overall mean does not reflect the mean scores of the customized items developed specifically for BCC.

**Table 11.** Mean Climate Scores as Rated by Personnel Classifications and by Year of Administration


	<b>Institutional Structure</b>	<b>Supervisory Relationships</b>	<b>Teamwork</b>	<b>Student Focus</b>	<b>Custom</b>	<b>Overall*</b>
<b>Administration</b>						
2009	3.89	3.36	3.71	3.83	3.31	3.68
2011	3.86	3.41	3.95	3.98	3.69	3.74
<b>Faculty</b>						
2009	3.53	3.15	3.65	3.89	3.25	3.51
2011	3.78	3.53	3.73	4.02	3.65	3.76
<b>Other Professionals</b>						
2009	3.47	2.96	3.49	3.78	3.14	3.39
2011	3.42	3.04	3.49	3.89	3.63	3.42
<b>Support Staff</b>						
2009	3.34	3.07	3.14	3.79	3.21	3.33
2011	3.41	3.15	3.41	3.88	3.77	3.43

\* The overall mean does not reflect the mean scores of the customized items developed specifically for BCC.

<b>Institutional Structure</b>		<b>Administration</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Other Professionals</b>	<b>Support Staff</b>
1	The extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission	3.59	3.83	3.53	3.44
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	3.32	3.33	2.97	2.87
5	The extent to which the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace	3.91	4.03	3.86	3.88
6	The extent to which administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students	3.86	3.69	3.53	3.69
10	The extent to which information is shared within this institution	3.09	3.36	2.70	2.78
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.15	3.38	2.84	3.17
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	3.27	3.11	2.66	2.85
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	2.94	3.38	2.78	3.02
22	The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.54	3.59	2.91	2.93
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	3.20	3.41	2.91	2.74
29	The extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work	3.60	3.63	3.26	3.33

32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	3.06	3.42	2.78	2.91
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	3.30	3.31	2.59	2.43
41	The extent to which I receive adequate information regarding important activities at this institution	3.66	3.77	3.27	3.65
44	The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	3.41	3.56	2.89	3.34

**Figure 5.** Mean Scores of the Institutional Structure Climate Factor as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College



Collaborative


Consultative

Competitive

Coercive


Supervisory Relationships		Administration	Faculty	Other Professionals	Support Staff
2	The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work	4.17	4.20	3.71	3.93
9	The extent to which my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of everyone	4.11	3.94	3.72	3.77
12	The extent to which positive work expectations are communicated to me	3.68	3.61	3.29	3.35
13	The extent to which unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me	3.61	3.62	3.35	3.33
20	The extent to which I receive timely feedback for my work	3.74	3.67	3.30	3.17
21	The extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work	3.74	3.74	3.38	3.35
26	The extent to which my supervisor actively seeks my ideas	4.03	3.62	3.51	3.33
27	The extent to which my supervisor seriously considers my ideas	4.09	3.77	3.44	3.37
30	The extent to which work outcomes are clarified for me	3.63	3.60	3.16	3.22
34	The extent to which my supervisor helps me to improve my work	3.71	3.70	3.39	3.35
39	The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work	4.06	4.13	3.54	3.38
45	The extent to which I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums	3.88	3.64	3.29	3.23
46	The extent to which professional development and training opportunities are available	3.71	3.81	3.34	3.38

**Figure 6.** Mean Scores of the Supervisory Relationships Climate Factor as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College




<b>Teamwork</b>		<b>Administration</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Other Professionals</b>	<b>Support Staff</b>
3	The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team	3.94	3.84	3.47	3.60
14	The extent to which my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques	3.71	3.73	3.59	3.46
24	The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team	4.09	3.69	3.47	3.25
33	The extent to which my work team provides an environment for free and open expression of ideas, opinions, and beliefs	4.06	3.76	3.51	3.33
36	The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals and teams	3.97	3.77	3.59	3.61
43	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.94	3.72	3.30	3.36

**Figure 7.** Mean Scores of the Teamwork Climate Factor as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College




Student Focus		Administration	Faculty	Other Professionals	Support Staff
7	The extent to which student needs are central to what we do	4.12	3.96	3.81	3.71
8	The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission	4.49	4.39	4.36	4.24
17	The extent to which faculty meet the needs of the students	3.65	3.95	3.69	3.70
18	The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution	4.29	4.32	4.18	4.13
19	The extent to which students' competencies are enhanced	3.93	3.96	3.72	3.62
23	The extent to which non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of the students	3.59	3.72	3.87	3.62
28	The extent to which classified personnel meet the needs of the students	3.39	3.70	3.41	3.43
31	The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution	4.03	4.11	4.08	4.18
35	The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career	3.88	4.06	3.99	4.06
37	The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning	4.00	4.14	3.99	4.10
40	The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development	3.86	3.95	3.82	3.77
42	The extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experience at this institution	3.90	3.89	3.65	3.82

**Figure 8.** Mean Scores of the Student Focus Climate Factor as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College



Customized		Administration	Faculty	Other Professionals	Support Staff
47	The extent to which faculty and staff at this institution understand the needs of students requiring developmental education	3.86	3.86	3.67	3.98
48	The extent to which the faculty across the institution is committed to meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.72	3.82	3.61	3.88
49	The extent to which the students completing developmental education courses are ready for college-level courses	3.68	3.42	3.55	3.94
50	The extent to which non-teaching professional staff is meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.56	3.62	3.67	3.77
51	The extent to which student services personnel is providing adequate support to students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.59	3.64	3.64	3.54
52	The extent to which students receive an excellent developmental education at this institution	3.90	3.73	3.73	3.81
53	The extent to which this institution effectively prepares students in developmental education to achieve their academic goals	3.79	3.65	3.67	3.89
54	The extent to which students in developmental education appear to be satisfied with their educational experience	3.70	3.66	3.63	3.97
55	The extent to which faculty and staff collaborate to enhance the experience of students in development education	3.70	3.66	3.61	3.75
56	The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them	3.54	3.47	3.52	3.86

**Figure 9.** Mean Scores of the Customized Climate Factor as Rated by Personnel Classifications at Bergen Community College



Tables 12 through 15 contain the top priorities for discussion for each Personnel Classification among the standard PACE items and the top priorities for discussion from the customized items developed specifically for Bergen Community College.

**Table 12.** Priorities for Change: Administration (President's Cabinet; Chief Officer; Dean; Director; Manager)

	<b>Area to Change</b>	<b>Mean</b>
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	2.94
32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	3.06
10	The extent to which information is shared within this institution	3.09
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.15
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	3.20
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	3.27
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	3.30
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	3.32
28	The extent to which classified personnel meet the needs of the students	3.39
44	The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	3.41
	<b>Area to Change—Customized</b>	<b>Mean</b>
56	The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them	3.54
50	The extent to which non-teaching professional staff is meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.56
51	The extent to which student services personnel is providing adequate support to students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.59

**Table 13.** Priorities for Change: Faculty (Full-time; Lecturer; Adjunct)

<b>Area to Change</b>		<b>Mean</b>
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	3.11
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	3.31
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	3.33
10	The extent to which information is shared within this institution	3.36
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.38
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	3.38
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	3.41
32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	3.42
44	The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	3.56
22	The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.59
<b>Area to Change—Customized</b>		
49	The extent to which the students completing developmental education courses are ready for college-level courses	3.42
56	The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them	3.47
50	The extent to which non-teaching professional staff is meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.62

**Table 14.** Priorities for Change: Other Professionals (Library; Counselor; Professional/Technical Assistants; all other Professional Staff)

<b>Area to Change</b>		<b>Mean</b>
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	2.59
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	2.66
10	The extent to which information is shared within this institution	2.70
32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	2.78
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	2.78
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	2.84
44	The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	2.89
22	The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	2.91
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	2.91
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	2.97
<b>Area to Change—Customized</b>		<b>Mean</b>
56	The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them	3.52
49	The extent to which the students completing developmental education courses are ready for college-level courses	3.55
48	The extent to which the faculty across the institution is committed to meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.61
55	The extent to which faculty and staff collaborate to enhance the experience of students in development education.	3.61

**Table 15.** Priorities for Change: Support Staff (Clerical/Secretarial Staff; Service/maintenance; Public Safety)

<b>Area to Change</b>		<b>Mean</b>
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	2.43
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	2.74
10	The extent to which information is shared within this institution	2.78
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	2.85
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	2.87
32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	2.91
22	The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	2.93
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	3.02
20	The extent to which I receive timely feedback for my work	3.17
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.17
<b>Area to Change—Customized</b>		<b>Mean</b>
51	The extent to which student services personnel is providing adequate support to students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.54
55	The extent to which faculty and staff collaborate to enhance the experience of students in development education	3.75
50	The extent to which non-teaching professional staff is meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses	3.77

## Comparative Analysis: Demographic Classifications

As depicted in Table 16, Asian employees rated the climate highest within its demographic group (3.98). In terms of length of employment those individuals with less than 5 years of employment rated the climate highest (3.77). Employees identifying with Other (Including Two or more races, not Hispanic or Latino; American Indian or Alaska Native, not Hispanic or Latino; and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, not Hispanic or Latino) rated the climate lowest within its demographic group 3.51, while respondents with 11-20 years of employment rated the climate with a composite rating of 3.54.

**Table 16.** Mean Climate Scores as Rated by Personnel in Various Demographic Classifications

	Institutional Structure	Supervisory Relationships	Teamwork	Student Focus	Customized	Overall*
<b>What is your personnel classification:</b>						
Administration (President's Cabinet; Chief Officer; Dean; Director; Manager)	3.86	3.41	3.95	3.98	3.69	3.74
Faculty (Full-time; Lecturer; Adjunct)	3.78	3.53	3.73	4.02	3.65	3.76
Other Professionals (Library; Counselor; Professional/Technical Assistants; all other Professional Staff)	3.42	3.04	3.49	3.89	3.63	3.42
Support Staff (Clerical/Secretarial Staff; Service/maintenance; Public Safety)	3.41	3.15	3.41	3.88	3.77	3.43
<b>Your status at this institution is:</b>						
Full-time	3.62	3.25	3.62	3.92	3.57	3.57
Part-time	3.83	3.73	3.77	4.09	3.89	3.86
<b>Please select the race/ethnicity that best describes you:</b>						
Hispanic or Latino, of any race	3.64	3.42	3.60	4.00	3.74	3.64
Asian, not Hispanic or Latino	3.94	3.89	3.97	4.12	4.01	3.98
Black, not Hispanic or Latino	3.62	3.33	3.66	3.99	3.72	3.62
White, not Hispanic or Latino	3.70	3.39	3.68	3.99	3.65	3.67
Other (Including Two or more races, not Hispanic or Latino; American Indian or Alaska Native, not Hispanic or Latino; and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, not Hispanic or Latino)	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.84	3.58	3.51

\* The overall mean does not reflect the mean scores of the customized items developed specifically for Bergen Community College.

**Table 16.** Continued

	Institutional Structure	Supervisory Relationships	Teamwork	Student Focus	Customized	Overall*
<b>How long have you worked at the College:</b>						
Less than 5 years	3.80	3.59	3.74	3.96	3.75	3.77
5-10 years	3.63	3.35	3.62	3.98	3.68	3.62
11-20 years	3.56	3.23	3.55	3.93	3.50	3.54
21 or more years	3.67	3.28	3.74	4.05	3.67	3.64
<b>If you are a faculty member, what is your current rank:</b>						
Professor	3.71	3.18	3.58	4.01	3.41	3.59
Associate Professor	3.68	3.17	3.73	3.90	3.27	3.58
Assistant Professor	3.64	3.36	3.61	3.95	3.54	3.62
Lecturer	4.10	3.85	4.13	4.20	3.92	4.05
Instructor	3.73	3.60	3.92	3.96	3.83	3.77
Adjunct/Part-time Faculty	3.80	3.68	3.73	4.07	3.84	3.83

\* The overall mean does not reflect the mean scores of the customized items developed specifically for Bergen Community College.


## Comparative Analysis: Norm Base

Table 17 and Figure 10 show how BCC compares with the NILIE PACE Norm Base, which includes approximately 60 different climate studies conducted at two year institutions since 2007. These studies include small, medium, and large institutions. Institutions range in size from 1,200 credit students on one campus to 22,000 credit students enrolled on multiple campuses. The Norm Base is updated each year to include the prior 2-year period. Normative data are not available for the Customized climate factor area developed specifically for BCC. Table 17 and Figure 10 also show how the current administration of the PACE survey at BCC compares with the 2009 administration based on the four PACE climate factors (i.e., Institutional Structure, Supervisory Relationships, Teamwork, and Student Focus) maintained by NILIE.

**Table 17.** Bergen Community College Climate compared with the NILIE PACE Norm Base

	BCC 2009	BCC 2011	Norm Base*
Institutional Structure	3.53	3.68	3.70
Supervisory Relationships	3.12	3.40	3.38
Teamwork	3.53	3.67	3.73
Student Focus	3.84	3.99	3.94
Overall	3.47	3.66	3.66

**Figure 10.** Bergen Community College Climate Compared with the NILIE PACE Norm Base



\* Normative data are not available for the customized climate factor developed specifically for BCC. Thus, the customized items are not included in the calculation of the overall mean.

Tables 18-21 shows how BCC compares question by question to the PACE Norm Base maintained by NILIE.

**Table 18.** Institutional Structure Mean Scores Compared to the NILIE Norm Base

	<b>Institutional Structure</b>	<b>BCC Mean</b>	<b>Norm Base</b>
1	The extent to which the actions of this institution reflect its mission	3.72	3.78
4	The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution	3.23	3.17
5	The extent to which the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace	3.96*	3.77
6	The extent to which administrative leadership is focused on meeting the needs of students	3.69	3.63
10	The extent to which information is shared within the institution	3.17	3.11
11	The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques	3.24	3.31
15	The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution	3.03	3.10
16	The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution	3.20	3.24
22	The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance	3.39	3.36
25	The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution	3.23	3.28
29	The extent to which institution-wide policies guide my work	3.53	3.58
32	The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized	3.21	3.22
38	The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution	3.07	3.08
41	The extent to which I receive adequate information regarding important activities at this institution	3.66	3.61
44	The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes	3.41	3.39
	<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.70</b>

\* T-test results indicate a significant difference between the mean and the Norm Base mean ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

**Table 19.** Supervisory Relationships Mean Scores Compared to the NILIE Norm Base

<b>Supervisory Relationships</b>	<b>BCC Mean</b>	<b>Norm Base</b>
2 The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work	4.08	4.09
9 The extent to which my supervisor is open to the ideas, opinions, and beliefs of everyone	3.89	3.97
12 The extent to which positive work expectations are communicated to me	3.53	3.60
13 The extent to which unacceptable behaviors are identified and communicated to me	3.54	3.56
20 The extent to which I receive timely feedback for my work	3.56	3.57
21 The extent to which I receive appropriate feedback for my work	3.64	3.60
26 The extent to which my supervisor actively seeks my ideas	3.60	3.65
27 The extent to which my supervisor seriously considers my ideas	3.69	3.72
30 The extent to which work outcomes are clarified for me	3.48	3.54
34 The extent to which my supervisor helps me to improve my work	3.60	3.66
39 The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work	3.93	3.92
45 The extent to which I have the opportunity to express my ideas in appropriate forums	3.54	3.56
46 The extent to which professional development and training opportunities are available	3.68	3.64
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.38</b>

**Table 20.** Teamwork Mean Scores Compared to the NILIE Norm Base

<b>Teamwork</b>	<b>BCC Mean</b>	<b>Norm Base</b>
3 The extent to which there is a spirit of cooperation within my work team	3.76	3.83
14 The extent to which my primary work team uses problem-solving techniques	3.68	3.72
24 The extent to which there is an opportunity for all ideas to be exchanged within my work team	3.63	3.68
33 The extent to which my work team provides an environment for free and open expression	3.68	3.72
36 The extent to which my work team coordinates its efforts with appropriate individuals	3.73	3.73
43 The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists in my department	3.62	3.73
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.73</b>

\* T-test results indicate no significant differences between the means and the Norm Base means ( $\alpha=0.05$ )

**Table 21.** Student Focus Mean Scores Compared to the NILIE Norm Base

<b>Student Focus</b>	<b>BCC Mean</b>	<b>Norm Base</b>
7 The extent to which student needs are central to what we do	3.92	3.80
8 The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission	4.38	4.33
17 The extent to which faculty meet the needs of students	3.86	3.92
18 The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution	4.27*	3.94
19 The extent to which students' competencies are enhanced	3.88	3.85
23 The extent to which non-teaching professional personnel meet the needs of the students	3.73*	3.85
28 The extent to which classified personnel meet the needs of the students	3.60*	3.81
31 The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution	4.10	4.07
35 The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career	4.04	4.04
37 The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning	4.11	4.04
40 The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development	3.91*	3.80
42 The extent to which students are satisfied with their educational experience	3.85	3.89
<b>Mean Total</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>3.94</b>
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>3.66</b>

\* T-test results indicate a significant difference between the mean and the Norm Base mean ( $\alpha=0.05$ )


## Qualitative Analysis

Respondents were given an opportunity to write comments about areas of the institution they found most favorable and least favorable. Of the 463 Bergen Community College employees who completed the PACE survey, 48.8% (226 respondents) provided written comments. In analyzing the written data there is a degree of researcher interpretation in categorizing the individual comments, however, reliability is ensured by coding all responses back to the questions on the PACE survey.

Figure 11 provides a summary of the BCC comments. This summary is based on Herzberg's (1982) two-factor model of motivation. NILIE has modified the model to represent the PACE factors by classifying the comments into the most appropriate PACE climate factors. This approach illustrates how each factor contributes to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the respondents. Please note that when asked for opinions, it is common for respondents to write a greater number of negative comments than positive comments.

The greatest numbers of comments across all factors fell within the Institutional Structure and Student Focus climate factors. Please refer to Tables 22 and 23 for sample comments categorized by climate factor and the actual number of responses provided by BCC employees. This sample of open-ended comments reflects employee responses as coded back to the questions of the PACE survey. Please note that comments are quoted exactly as written except in instances where the integrity of the report is compromised.

**Figure 11.** Bergen Community College Comment Response Rates



*Note:* Adapted from Herzberg, F. (1982). *The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human* (2nd ed.). Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus Publishing Company

## CONCLUSION

One of the primary purposes of the PACE instrument is to provide insight that will assist in efforts to improve the climate at an institution or system of institutions. To accomplish this goal, the mean scores for each of the items were arranged in ascending order, from the lowest to the highest values. The distance between each item mean and the ideal situation, represented by a score of 4.50 on any item, can be identified as a measure of the extent to which individuals and groups can be motivated through leadership to improve the climate within the institution. Thus, the gap between the scores on what is and what could be for each item is the zone of possible change within the institution. Those items with the highest values are viewed as areas of satisfaction or excellence within the climate. Conversely, those items with the lowest values are the areas of least satisfaction or in need of improvement.

Overall the following have been identified as the top performance areas at Bergen Community College. Seven of these items represent the Student Focus climate factor (items #7, #8, #18, #31, #35, #37, and #40), two represent the Supervisory Relationships climate factor (items #2 and #39), and one represents the Institutional Structure climate factor (item #5).

- The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to this institution's mission, 4.38 (#8)
- The extent to which student ethnic and cultural diversity are important at this institution, 4.27 (#18)
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for further learning, 4.11 (#37)
- The extent to which students receive an excellent education at this institution, 4.10 (#31)
- The extent to which my supervisor expresses confidence in my work, 4.08 (#2)
- The extent to which this institution prepares students for a career, 4.04 (#35)
- The extent to which the institution effectively promotes diversity in the workplace, 3.96 (#5)
- The extent to which I am given the opportunity to be creative in my work, 3.93 (#39)
- The extent to which student needs are central to what we do, 3.92 (#7)
- The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development, 3.91 (#40)

Overall the following have been identified as the top performance areas within the Customized Climate factor at Bergen Community College.

- The extent to which faculty and staff at this institution understand the needs of students requiring developmental education, 3.84 (#47)
- The extent to which the faculty across the institution is committed to meeting the needs of students enrolled in developmental education courses, 3.79 (#48)
- The extent to which students receive an excellent developmental education at this institution, 3.75 (#52)

Overall the following have been identified as areas in need of improvement at Bergen Community College. Each of these items represents the Institutional Structure climate factor.

- The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within this institution, 3.07 (#38)
- The extent to which I am able to appropriately influence the direction of this institution, 3.03 (#15)
- The extent to which information is shared within this institution, 3.17 (#10)
- The extent to which open and ethical communication is practiced at this institution, 3.20 (#16)
- The extent to which this institution is appropriately organized, 3.21 (#32)
- The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at this institution, 3.23 (#25)
- The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at this institution, 3.23 (#4)
- The extent to which institutional teams use problem-solving techniques, 3.24 (#11)
- The extent to which this institution has been successful in positively motivating my performance, 3.39 (#22)
- The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes, 3.41 (#44)

Overall the following have been identified as the areas in need of improvement within the Customized Climate factor at Bergen Community College.

- The extent to which the students completing developmental education courses are ready for college-level courses, 3.51 (#49)
- The extent to which instructors of developmental education courses and college-level-course instructors communicate on developmental education issues and collaborate to address them, 3.52 (#56)
- The extent to which student services personnel is providing adequate support to students enrolled in developmental education courses, 3.63 (#51)

The most favorable areas cited in the open-ended questions pertain to the Student Focus climate factor, and specifically the institution's performance in meeting the needs of the students. The least favorable aspects cited in the open-ended responses are consistent with the survey mean scores in that they reinforce a desire to call attention to specific issues regarding the Institutional Structure, specifically concerns with the spirit of cooperation within the institution.

## REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. & Astin, H. S. (2000). *Leadership reconsidered: Engaging higher education in social change*. Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation.
- Babbie, E. R. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Baker, G. A., & Associates. (1992). *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges*. Washington, DC: Community College Press.
- Baker, G. A., & Glass, J. C. (1993). *The McClelland-Atkinson model of motivation*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Texas at Austin.
- Bass, D. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Blanchard, K. (1985). *Situational leadership II*. San Diego: Blanchard Training and Development.
- Bolman, L.G. & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Caison, A. (2005). *PACE survey instrument exploratory factor analysis*. Report, NILIE, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., McKee, A. & Boyatzis, R. E. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- House, R. J. (1971). A path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321-338.
- Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, 28(3), 315-336.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1996). *Connective leadership: Managing in a changing world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Northouse, P.G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Roueche, J. E., & Baker, G. A. (1987). *Access and excellence: The open-door college*. Washington DC: Community College Press.
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tiu, S. (2001). *Institutional effectiveness in higher education: Factor analysis of the personal assessment of college environment survey instrument*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.
- Yukl, G. S. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.