

PACE CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

An initiative of the Belk Center at NC State

706 Hillsborough Street | Raleigh, NC 27603

Northeast Lakeview College San Antonio, Texas

PACE Custom Report PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges

Lead Researchers Greyson A. B. Norcross & Ece Yilmaz **Conducted** September and October 2022

pace.ncsu.edu | pace_survey@ncsu.edu | (919) 515-8567

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education



PACE CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY

An initiative of the Belk Center at NC State

Research Team

Audrey J. Jaeger, Ph.D. Executive Director

Maso H. Cotton Research Associate

Greyson A. B. Norcross Research Associate Kaitlin N. S. Newhouse, Ph.D. Senior Research Associate

Dion T. Harry Research Associate

Emily R. VanZoest Research Associate Jessica R. Bank Research Associate

Lauren E. McGuire Research Associate

Ece Yilmaz Research Associate

Phone (919)515-8567

(919)515-6305

Fax

Web pace.ncsu.edu

Email pace_survey@ncsu.edu

North Carolina State University

Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research 706 Hillsborough Street Raleigh, NC 27603

Suggested Citation: Belk Center for Community College Leadership and Research, North Carolina State University. PACE Climate Survey for Community Colleges Custom Report, by Norcross, G. A. B., & Yilmaz, E. Raleigh, NC: 2022.

NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Table of Contents

Table 1.	Custom Items Frequency Distributions	1
Table 2.	Custom Item Mean Comparisons	4
Table 3.	Custom Demographic Frequency Distributions	6
Table 4.	Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	7
Table 5.	Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	8
Table 6.	Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel	9
	Classification	
Table 7.	Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	10
Table 8.	Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification	11

Page

Table 1. Custom Items Frequency Distributions

NLC compared with:

		NLC		20		
Custom Items	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%	
1 I understand the priorities of the institution	Strongly Disagree	5	3%	2	2%	
	Disagree	14	9%	3	2%	
	Neither	15	10%	13	10%	
	Agree	75	49%	53	43%	
	Strongly Agree	45	29%	53	43%	
	Total	154	100%	124	100%	
2 Innovation is encouraged at the institution	Strongly Disagree	8	5%	3	2%	
	Disagree	22	15%	12	10%	
	Neither	30	20%	17	14%	
	Agree	57	38%	49	40%	
	Strongly Agree	33	22%	43	35%	
	Total	150	100%	124	100%	
3 I participate in decisions at the institution	Strongly Disagree	18	13%	8	7%	
	Disagree	35	24%	12	10%	
	Neither	32	22%	32	27%	
	Agree	38	26%	37	31%	
	Strongly Agree	21	15%	30	25%	
	Total	144	100%	119	100%	
4 Differences of opinion are encouraged at the	Strongly Disagree	23	15%	10	8%	
institution	Disagree	33	22%	14	11%	
	Neither	42	28%	35	28%	
	Agree	31	21%	39	31%	
	Strongly Agree	21	14%	26	21%	
	Total	150	100%	124	100%	

		N	LC	2	021
Custom Items (continued)	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
5 I am satisfied with my overall employment	Strongly Disagree	9	6%	3	2%
experience at this institution	Disagree	15	10%	9	7%
	Neither	30	20%	18	14%
	Agree	58	38%	50	40%
	Strongly Agree	41	27%	45	36%
	Total	153	100%	125	100%
6 The institution's leadership/supervisory structure	Strongly Disagree	22	15%	12	10%
is representing my interests	Disagree	23	16%	7	6%
	Neither	30	21%	28	23%
	Agree	42	29%	43	35%
	Strongly Agree	29	20%	34	27%
	Total	146	100%	124	100%
7 Policies affecting faculty and staff are consistent	Strongly Disagree	21	14%	12	10%
across campus	Disagree	35	24%	19	16%
	Neither	28	19%	19	16%
	Agree	40	28%	37	31%
	Strongly Agree	21	14%	33	28%
	Total	145	100%	120	100%
8 The institution's technology tools allow me to	Strongly Disagree	7	5%	3	2%
meet my job responsibilities efficiently	Disagree	21	14%	11	9%
	Neither	20	13%	17	14%
	Agree	69	45%	46	37%
	Strongly Agree	37	24%	47	38%
	Total	154	100%	124	100%

		Ν	LC	20	021
Custom Items (continued)	Response Option	Count	%	Count	%
9 Workload demands for my time are included in	Strongly Disagree	20	14%	11	9%
the institution level planning process	Disagree	34	23%	20	16%
	Neither	32	22%	31	25%
	Agree	39	27%	36	29%
	Strongly Agree	22	15%	25	20%
	Total	147	100%	123	100%
10 The institution provides a safe and secure	Strongly Disagree	3	2%	2	2%
working environment	Disagree	6	4%	5	4%
	Neither	20	13%	15	12%
	Agree	75	50%	47	37%
	Strongly Agree	47	31%	57	45%
	Total	151	100%	126	100%
11 I would recommend working at the Alamo	Strongly Disagree	10	7%	1	1%
Colleges	Disagree	9	6%	7	6%
	Neither	28	19%	21	17%
	Agree	55	36%	43	34%
	Strongly Agree	49	32%	54	43%
	Total	151	100%	126	100%

Table 2. Custom Item Mean Comparisons

		NLC			2021	
	Custom Items	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
1	I understand the priorities of the institution	154	3.916	4.226	**	326
2	Innovation is encouraged at the institution	150	3.567	3.944	**	342
3	I participate in decisions at the institution	144	3.063	3.580	***	424
4	Differences of opinion are encouraged at the institution	150	2.960	3.460	***	407
5	I am satisfied with my overall employment experience at this institution	153	3.699	4.000	*	277
6	The institution's leadership/supervisory structure is representing my interests	146	3.226	3.645	**	326
7	Policies affecting faculty and staff are consistent across campus	145	3.034	3.500	**	356
8	The institution's technology tools allow me to meet my job responsibilities efficiently	154	3.701	3.992	*	268
9	Workload demands for my time are included in the institution level planning process	147	3.061	3.358		
10	The institution provides a safe and secure working environment	151	4.040	4.206		

	NLC			2021	
Custom Items (Continued)	Ν	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
11 I would recommend working at the Alamo Colleges	151	3.821	4.127	*	289

Table 3. Custom Demographic Frequency Distributions

			NLC		20	21
Demographic Items	Response Option		Count	%	Count	%
1 What is your personnel classification?	Administrator		9	6%	6	5%
	Full time Staff		73	49%	52	41%
	Full time Faculty		50	34%	41	33%
	Part time Staff		4	3%	10	8%
	Adjunct/CE Faculty		10	7%	16	13%
	Work Study		2	1%	1	1%
	Tot	tal	148	100%	126	100%

Table 4. Institutional Structure Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	N	NLC 2021			
What is your personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	160	3.443	3.773	**	356
Administrator	9	4.311			
Full time Staff	73	3.525	3.862	*	369
Full time Faculty	50	3.044	3.485	*	517
Part time Staff	4		3.767		
Adjunct/CE Faculty	10	3.995	4.252		
Work Study	2				

Table 5. Student Focus Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	NLC		2021		
What is your personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	160	4.138	4.194		
Administrator	9	4.593			
Full time Staff	73	4.092	4.240		
Full time Faculty	50	4.130	4.150		
Part time Staff	4		4.170		
Adjunct/CE Faculty	10	4.335	4.246		
Work Study	2				

Table 6. Supervisory Relationships Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	N	LC	2021		
What is your personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	160	3.911	4.129	*	266
Administrator	9	4.479			
Full time Staff	73	3.890	4.114		
Full time Faculty	50	3.861	4.151		
Part time Staff	4		4.067		
Adjunct/CE Faculty	10	4.311	4.387		
Work Study	2				

Table 7. Teamwork Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	NLC		202		
What is your personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	160	3.958	4.156	*	233
Administrator	9	4.537			
Full time Staff	73	3.926	4.229		
Full time Faculty	50	3.896	4.142		
Part time Staff	4		4.150		
Adjunct/CE Faculty	10	4.087	4.146		
Work Study	2				

Table 8. Overall Item Mean Comparisons by Personnel Classification

	NLC		202		
What is your personnel classification?	N	Mean	Mean	Sig.	Effect size
Overall	160	3.817	4.028	*	290
Administrator	9	4.461			
Full time Staff	73	3.820	4.077		
Full time Faculty	50	3.667	3.930		
Part time Staff	4		4.006		
Adjunct/CE Faculty	10	4.185	4.271		
Work Study	2				