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ABSTRACT

INSTITUTIONAL CLIMATE AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

AT THREE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

Connie S. Buckner

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to explore the impact of employee morale, as manifested in institutional climate data, upon institutional effectiveness; and (2) to determine the extent to which information generated by climate survey data was used in developing and implementing change initiatives at each of the institutions studied.

Three institutions were selected for this multiple site case study. Four sources of data from each institution were used to provide a "picture" of institutional climate. These sources of data were (a) the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) climate survey, (b) institutional self-study reports, (c) reaffirmation team reports, and (d) employee interviews. These four sources of data also provided opportunity for triangulation, a method to ensure internal validity. External validity was established by cross-case analysis and peer review.

Indications of institutional climate were consistent across all four data sources. The institution in which climate was perceived as "excellent" was also recognized by the reaffirmation team of its accrediting agency as an "exemplary institution. . . Few institutions have such tremendous energy at all levels as (this) College. It holds the promise of being an exemplary institution for the rest of this century and the next" (Reaffirmation Team Summary, 1996, p. 1). In contrast, the reaffirmation team of the institution in which the climate was "dreadful" indicated that "The College is in a difficult position to demonstrate through verifiable means, its attainment of purposes and objectives both inside and outside the classroom" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 9).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Results of the study indicated disparity in employee morale and thus in institutional climate. Employees of one institution consistently indicated that "the climate is excellent" (Professor, 1996). Employees of the second institution indicated that the "climate is better, but could be improved" (Support Staff, 1996), and employees of the third institution indicated that "people here work under dreadful conditions" (Professional Support Staff, 1996).

Additionally, the results indicated that equally as important as conducting climate surveys was the use of the results in effecting change. Employees at all three institutions consistently stated that it was "seeing the results" (Associate Professor, 1996) that actually made the difference. At one institution evidence of change resulting from employee input indicated to them that "there is not a 'we-they' atmosphere here... that they (employees) are important to the overall mission of the College" (Associate Professor, 1996). In contrast, employees of the second institution stated that "we do not revisit the issues... ten years is a long time" (Instructor, 1996) and "people are questioning whether we are going backwards toward a more autocratic system" (Associate Dean, 1996). Employees at the third institution stated that "unfortunately the results just sit in a drawer... if we had followed some of the priorities and actually did some planning and implemented it, I am sure there would have been some positive changes" (Professional Support Staff, 1996).

It appeared that the difference in the three institutions studied was that employees of the institution in which the climate was perceived as "excellent" were respected for their intelligence, knowledge, and for their contributions to the success of the institution. Employees of the institution in which the climate was "dreadful" indicated a perception that they were not respected for their contributions to the institution and that there was a lack of trust among administrators and employees.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Organizational effectiveness has been a concern among corporate leaders and those studying industrial and business organizations for many years. In 1941, Thorndike (in Katz & Kahn, 1966) identified several primary indicators of organizational effectiveness. These indicators were productivity, the extent to which organizations accomplished their varied missions, net profit, and the success in maintaining and expanding the organization. Georgopoulous and Tannenbaum (1969) defined effectiveness in organizations as "the extent to which an organization as a social system, given certain resources and means, fulfills its objectives without incapacitating its means and resources and without placing undue strain upon its members" (p. 82).

Accountability for organizational effectiveness in higher education, however, appears to be a relatively new phenomenon. For example, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which specifies the criteria for
accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation of higher education institutions, first devoted a full section to institutional effectiveness in accreditation criteria published in 1983. "An institution has an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and to use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1995, p. 15).

Licensing boards, outside funding agencies, state and local governing boards, and business and industry are also requiring verification that higher education institutions are effectively utilizing educational resources (Astin, 1991; Parnell, 1990; Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Additionally, parents and students are seeking institutions which demonstrate effectiveness in delivering quality educational programs and services.

Historically, institutions of higher education have used data on student enrollment, retention, and graduation rates as measures of their effectiveness. These institutions have also cited library and equipment acquisitions and new facilities as further evidence of their effectiveness. More recently, the educational community has
focused on effectiveness measures such as educational outcomes verified by various assessment programs (Astin, 1991), quantifiable data on student enrollment patterns, objective standards, and data supporting the achievement of their various statements of purpose (Burrill, 1994).

Organizations, including those of higher education, are comprised of inputs, transformations, and outputs (Argyris, 1964). These organizations are also social systems which have been "deliberately established to carry out some definite purpose" (Caplow, 1983, p. 135). Studies of organizations as social systems conducted by Parsons (in Katz & Kahn, 1966) utilized the open-systems approach which emphasized the close connection between the organization and its support systems.

Some open-systems approaches to effectiveness utilize cross-functional teams which are comprised of individuals from all levels of the organization affected by changes in a particular process or system. These individuals, as team members, have the authority to make major changes in the organization without seeking permission through various layers in the hierarchy. This freedom "stimulates collegewide cultural change by increasing trust,
cooperation, and . . . commitment to the primary educational mission of the institution" (Reed, 1995, p. 128).
Effectiveness follows open systems theory in that organizations influence, and are constantly influenced by, the environment in which they operate (Argyris, 1964). Outputs of open systems do not always vary in an orderly manner based upon any known input. Input includes people, materials, and energy (Argyris, 1964); and "human effort and motivation is the major maintenance source of almost all social structures" (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 9). As the environment around and within organizations and individuals changes, "so do the expectations of both parties" (Herriot, 1992, p. 72).

Senge (1990) indicated that organizations that "truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn" (p. 4). Bennis also stated "no matter how wise, shrewd, or visionary a leader is, a corporation is a collective endeavor, and it needs the collective wisdom, canniness, and vision of all its employees to function at the optimum level" (1989, p. 72-73).
Cameron (1986) identified three domains of organizational effectiveness for higher education--the academic domain, the external adaptation (environmental) domain, and the morale domain. The academic domain of effectiveness includes the graduation rates of institutions, quality of instruction as rated by students and potential employers, qualifications and experience of faculty, faculty research and publications, and student academic and career development (Cameron, 1986). The external or environmental domain is measured by the "ability of the organization to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources" (Cameron, 1978, p. 605). The morale domain is measured by faculty and administrator job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is determined by evaluating how employees feel about their ability to influence the direction of the institution, their work structure, internal communication, and participation in the decision making processes.

A related factor, also identified by Cameron as a predictor of organizational effectiveness, is the structure of the institution--"including centralization, professionalization, standardization, administrative ratio
diversity, and saga" (Cameron, 1986, p. 95). Saga is a part of institutional culture and is the "story that has become institutionalized over time and that describes significant individuals and events in an institution's history" (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 1991, p. 90).

In addition to the history of the institution, institutional culture is also comprised of traditions, its physical setting and symbols and symbolic action. Culture is unique to each institution, and "what is effective in one culture is not necessarily effective in another" (Kuh, et al., 1991, p. 70).

Cameron (1978, 1986), Yuchtman & Seashore (1967), Pennings (1975), and Nord (1983) concentrated specifically on the academic and external (environmental) domains in their studies of institutional effectiveness. The academic domain is measured by student assessment instruments such as pre- and posttests that determine the mathematical and verbal proficiencies of students. Tests are also used to determine the ability of students to think critically. The environmental (external adaptation) domain explores the impact low-level funding and periods of economic decline have on institutional effectiveness.
More recent studies used some of these same criteria. The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) (1994) organized its measures of effectiveness into three components: publics, performance, and perception. Publics refers to those external forces impacting the institution such as state and local legislators, the community, businesses, and parents. The performance indicator of effectiveness is shown by data that indicate the institution is meeting the needs of the students and other clients of the college. These data--such as information on student progress, career preparation, developmental education, general education, customized education, and community development--have also been identified as effectiveness measures (AACC, 1994). Perception involves the understanding of the goals and mission of the institution.

Organizations and institutions of higher education have many sources of energy (Argyris, 1964). One of the primary sources of energy is the psychological energy of the individuals within the organization. "Individuals differ in their aspirations; these change... and there are great social movements afoot which will affect what is generally valued and what is not" (Herriot, 1992, p. 5).
In previous studies conducted on organizational and institutional effectiveness, little attention has been devoted to the human component of institutional effectiveness. For example, Cameron (1986) in his study on institutional effectiveness identified five major factors as predictors of effectiveness. These factors were the external environment, institutional structure, institutional strategy, institutional demographics, and institutional finances. Cameron also stated that morale seemed to be "most strongly associated with strategies oriented toward academics, student affairs, and external constituencies" (Cameron, 1986, p. 101).

Other studies (Georgeopoulos & Tannenbaum, 1969; Katz & Kahn, 1966) focused on the open systems concept; effective institutions are those with efficient internal processes transforming inputs into outputs with minimum effort and expense. Others (Goodman, Atkin, & Schoorman, 1983) maintained that the effectiveness of an institution is determined by the constituents of an institution. Goal achievement and student outcomes assessment (Nichols, 1991, and Astin, 1991) have also been identified as measures of effectiveness.
In contrast, Schneider (1983) indicated that, although goals may energize and direct activity in the early stages of the development of the organization, "over time it is the structures and processes that emerge out of the interactions of people . . . that sustain activity and maintain directionality" (p. 34). Schneider also stated that studies of effectiveness must carefully consider the human component of organizations or the "attraction, selection, interactional patterns, and withdrawal processes of people" (p. 35). The human component manages resources, delivers instruction, and provides other service programs. "The old cliche' that 'an organization's most valuable asset is its people' doesn't go far enough. An organization is its people" (Herriot, 1992, p. 1). Additionally, Robson (1986) stated that for excellence to be achieved there is a need for all employees to feel a sense of ownership. . . . people will have to feel that it is worth their while if they are to give and to maintain their commitment. This "something" does not have to be tangible money reward, though this will help, but it does have to include a feeling that it is worth while from the point of view
of getting things done, being involved in a way which uses their talents, and being recognized for the contributions made (p. 58).

**Statement of the Problem**

Although extensive studies (Cameron, 1978, 1986; Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967; Pennings, 1975; and Nord, 1983) have been conducted on the academic domain and environmental domain of institutional effectiveness, few studies have been conducted on the impact of the perception of institutional climate upon judgments of institutional effectiveness.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was twofold: (1) to explore the impact of employee morale, as manifested in institutional climate data, upon institutional effectiveness; and (2) the extent to which the information generated by climate survey data was used in developing and implementing change initiatives at each of the institutions.

**Research Questions**

A primary focus of the study was employee morale, one of Cameron's (1986) three institutional effectiveness
domains. Climate survey results were used to determine the extent to which faculty and staff morale affect strategic planning and decision making at each of the three institutions selected for this study. The climate survey used for this study was the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) (Baker, 1992).

A comparison was made of employee attitudes as shown by the climate survey and the recommendations of the reaffirmation team directly related to academic programs and services. This comparison was made to determine the similarities, if any, between the two sources and to determine how climate survey data might be used in improving programs and services. Responses to interview questions addressed to the selected employees of each institution were also utilized to determine the extent climate survey data effected changes within the institutions. In addition, survey results and interview data were also reviewed to determine the extent to which employees assumed ownership in the mission of the institution.

This research focused on the following questions:

(1) What were the top priorities for change identified by the climate survey?
(2) What major problems identified by the climate survey were also identified in recommendations or suggestions of the reaffirmation team?

(3) How can faculty and staff morale scores be used to help identify potential recommendations affecting reaffirmation.

(4) What was the perception of the employees interviewed at each college regarding the accuracy of the information generated by the climate survey?

(5) How were the results of the survey used in institutional planning?

(6) How did the frequency of climate survey administration prove to be beneficial to planning for change within the institution?

(7) What factors contributed to individual employee perceptions of ownership in the mission of the institution?

**Significance of the Study**

For many decades, institutions of higher education have had little need to document the delivery of quality
educational programs and services. "Colleges have tended to say to their constituents and to their funding agencies, 'Trust us. What we do cannot be measured'" (Hudgins, 1993, p. 42). In recent years, however, state and local legislatures, accrediting agencies, employers, and consumers of educational programs provided by higher educational institutions have demanded proof of success. Accountability to their constituencies for tax-appropriated funds also has made it imperative that institutions seek methods to ensure quality educational programs (Marcus, Leone, & Goldberg, 1983). The accountability for funds in itself is sufficient evidence that institutions of higher education must identify factors which enable them to attain the objectives and goals stated in their respective mission statements and to prove to their constituencies their effectiveness in providing quality educational programs.

Definitions of Terms

The definitions of key terms used in this study follows:

Institutional Climate: For this study, climate is defined as the prevailing emotional state that is shared by the
members of the system (French, Bell, & Zawacki, 1989). "Climate is to an organization what personality is to an individual" (Padron, 1994, p. 40).

Institutional Effectiveness: A level of institutional quality determined by the institution's use of resources and processes of education, faculty and student qualifications, fiscal resources, etc., as measured against the goals and objectives outlined in its mission statement (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1995).

Reaffirmation Team: The reaffirmation team is an integral part of the accreditation process and is comprised of professionals from other institutions that have membership in the same regional accrediting agency, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. These professionals represent the major divisions of institutions: educational programs, student development, library, and fiscal resources, etc. This team recommends to the accrediting agency either renewal or nonrenewal of accreditation for the educational institution.
Self-Study: A thorough review to determine the effectiveness of an institution, i.e., its academic programs, fiscal resources and services, educational support services (library, student development) in achieving its mission and purpose. Committees for this review are comprised of employees of the institution who represent all the departments of the institution. These self-studies are conducted prior to the visit of the reaffirmation team.

**Limitations**

A primary limitation of this study was the threat of researcher bias. In a case study approach to research, "the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, the researcher, rather than through some inanimate inventory, questionnaire, or machine" (Merriam, 1988, p. 19). Thus, data are perceived through frames of reference that are unique to the researcher. "All observations and analyses are filtered through one's worldview, one's values, one's perspective" (Merriam, 1988, p. 39).
The best protection against researcher bias is to remain aware of how biases "slant and shape what we hear, how they interface with our reproduction" of the data (Guba & Lincoln in Merriam, 1988, p. 148). Another protection against researcher bias is the use of several sources of collecting data, called triangulation. "The opportunity to use multiple methods of data collection is a major strength of case study research" (Merriam, 1988, p. 69). Multiple data sources for each institution provide a method to confirm findings and to identify unique characteristics of each. In this study, the researcher used institutional climate survey results, self-study reports, reaffirmation team reports, employee interviews, college catalogs, and The College Handbook as sources of data.

Another limitation is that, due to the distant location of the institutions studied, structured interviews were conducted by telephone rather than on a person-to-person basis. Merriam (1988) indicated that the success of an interview depends upon the "interaction between the interviewer and respondent" (p. 86). Although interviews conducted by telephone enable a researcher to probe for detail, the researcher was unable to observe nonverbal
signals that may have provided clues for further probing or for a different approach in questioning.

Additionally, the lapse of time between the collection of data for the climate survey and the interview questions was a limitation. Some employees, when contacted for an interview, could not remember responding to the survey, the issues identified by the survey, whether or not they had read the results, or where to obtain a copy of the results. Others had difficulty in remembering whether or not issues were identified by the survey, the self-study report, and the reaffirmation team report.

**Overview of the Study**

This study is divided into five chapters that are organized in the following manner. Chapter one contains a general overview of the problems that consumers of educational programs and services and institutions alike encounter in validating effectiveness, a statement of the problem, and the purpose for the study. Chapter two includes discussions on organizational theory that forms the basis for effectiveness measures for institutions of higher education. Criteria used in the determination of
organizational effectiveness are also included. In addition, the second chapter also contains an examination of the various measures of institutional effectiveness.

The case study method of research is described in the third chapter. Chapter three also contains details about how each institution was selected for study. Additionally, the third chapter contains information on the reliability and validity of the climate survey instrument as well as descriptions of the various sources of data used in the study. Chapter four contains a description of each institution studied, and a summary of the information generated by the four data sources comprises the fifth chapter. These data sources are (a) the PACE climate surveys, (b) institutional self-study reports, (c) the recommendations of the reaffirmation team, and (d) the employee interviews. Chapter six contains an analysis of the information described and discussed in the fifth chapter. Conclusions and implications for further research comprise the seventh chapter.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness was defined by some early theorists as the level of productivity of the organization. Thorndike (in Katz & Kahn, 1966) considered the criteria for an effective organization to be (a) its productivity, (b) the extent the organization achieved its mission, (c) its ability to maintain or expand, and (d) its net profit. Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum (1969) define organizational effectiveness as productivity, flexibility in response to the environment, and the absence of conflict and tension within its various departments.

Katz & Kahn (1966) identified the efficiency of the design of operations and the extent the design is implemented in the performance of the activities of the organization as the measure of organizational effectiveness. Efficiency is defined as the "ratio of energetic output to energetic input. Efficiency tells us how much of the input of an organization emerges as product and how much is absorbed by the system" (Katz & Kahn, 1966, p. 170).
Argyris (1970) defined organizational effectiveness as the extent to which an organization performs its core activities. The core activities of the organization are to: (a) achieve objectives, (b) maintain the internal environment, and (c) remain flexible and adapt to the external environment. Organizational effectiveness, therefore, increases as the organization obtains: (a) "increasing outputs with constant or decreasing inputs, or (b) constant outputs with decreasing inputs, and (c) is able to accomplish this in such a way that it can continue to do so" (Argyris, 1964, p. 123).

Organizational theorists approach the problem of the identification of effectiveness measures with various methods, thus identifying different sets of indicators. Organizations with unique characteristics, public and private, have multiple meanings for effectiveness (Cameron & Whetton, 1983).

"Effectiveness estimates are always plural--potentially different and equally valid estimates for each constituent or constituency population" (Seashore, 1983, p. 64). Additionally, Goodman, Atkin, & Schoorman (1983) indicated that there is no general set of effectiveness indicators.
Effectiveness is simply taken from value judgments of an organization's constituents, and one constituent's judgment of effectiveness is no better than the judgment of another. "Given that there are different constituencies with different values about what constitutes organizational effectiveness, there is likely to be little convergence on the meaning of effectiveness (Goodman, et al., 1983, p. 165).

Weick & Daft (1983) also indicated that effectiveness is difficult to define because organizations are "vast, complex, fragmented, elusive, and multidimensional" (p.72). Usually, effectiveness is judged based upon the perceptions of the investigator.

Other commonly used predictors of organizational effectiveness include profitability predictors and productivity and efficiency constructs (Goodman, et al., 1983). Profitability predictors do not consider how the variables of profitability (capital, technology, labor, organizational and managerial factors, and environmental and market factors) affect profitability. Comparison or analysis of profitability cannot be considered across industries and certainly cannot be used to determine the
effectiveness of nonprofit organizations. Productivity and efficiency also are not always indicators of organizational effectiveness.

Centralization of the processes of the organization may increase productivity in terms of quantity and efficient utilization of materials, however, "it may also decrease innovation, morale, and quality of service . . . (Goodman, et al., 1983, p. 174). Cameron (1983) also indicated that productivity, since it can be measured, is a concept rather than a construct and that effectiveness is a result of much more than productivity alone.

Although early theorists primarily viewed effectiveness of organizations in terms of net profits and productivity, some recognized the impact individual members have upon the effectiveness of the organization (Argyris, 1964). Consideration of the technical competence of employees and emphasis upon that which is necessary to perform tasks to ensure productivity produces interpersonal mistrust among individual employees, supervisors, and subordinates.

The result is that conformity begins to develop within an organization. Members say and do those things that cannot be misunderstood and discuss only those issues
for which there exist "clear organizational values and sanctions" ... members behave in accordance with certain organizational specifications (Argyris, 1964, p. 102-103).

Motivation of individual employees was also interpreted primarily in economic terms (Bennis, 1969), a monetary remuneration in exchange for technical skills and the performance of certain duties or tasks for the organization.

"Elton Mayo and his associates were among the first to see human affiliation as a motivating force, to view industrial organization as a social system" (Bennis, 1969, p. 3). Caplow also described organizations as social systems "deliberately established to carry out some definite purpose" (Caplow in French, Bell, & Zawacki, 1989, p. 135).

As social systems, organizations are comprised of people who have "norms, values, shared beliefs, and paradigms of what is right and what is wrong, what is legitimate and what is not, and how things are done" (Bennis, 1989, p. 30). The obsession of the leaders of organizations with the bottom line or net profit has led to their inability "to see that ... workers are its primary asset" (Bennis, 1989, p. 85).
Senge (1990) identified systems thinking as the cornerstone of a learning organization. Systems thinking involves "a shift of mind from seeing parts to seeing wholes, from seeing people as helpless reactors to seeing them as active participants in shaping their reality" (p. 69). A key component in systems thinking is the commitment of all employees to the goals and vision of the organization. Organizations cannot sustain greatness "in the absence of goals, values and missions that become deeply shared throughout the organization" (Senge, 1990, p. 9).

Vogt & Murrell (1990) and Horton & Reid (1991) also recognized the importance of a shared vision or connectedness. Connectedness, however, cannot be induced, and "autocratic environments seldom produce connectedness" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p. 21). Employees who are unaware of the vision of the leaders of the organization or who do not believe in the vision function in organizations which "have no more direction than a rudderless ship" (Horton & Reid, 1991, p. 99). In addition, employees who have no part in the corporate vision act accordingly.

Herriot (1992) identified four underlying themes of ideal employees in future organizations. "Surviving
organizations will be those which achieve all the following balancing acts" (p. 67). These balancing acts are: (a) The organization must provide employees opportunities for adventure and exploration in their career goals and, at the same time, lend appropriate personal and professional support. (b) The organization must also foster loyalty and commitment among its employees, yet respect the individuality of each employee. (c) Employees of the organization must also have ample opportunities to attain knowledge and communicate that knowledge to others within and beyond the organization. Leaders of the organization must promote tolerance and recognition of the worth of individual employees. (d) Employees of surviving organizations must also have environmental intelligence, the ability to make intelligent sense of the environment, with corresponding autonomy to make decisions and the trust of their supervisors to implement them.

Theories of Effectiveness Measures in Higher Education

Until recent years, effectiveness of institutions of higher education has received little attention. Institutional effectiveness theories are grounded in
organizational effectiveness theories that have been adapted and/or modified for educational institutions. Empirical approaches to institutional effectiveness have not yet identified common boundaries or constructs of effectiveness (Seidman, 1993).

One widely used indicator of institutional effectiveness is the assessment of student outcomes. This indicator of effectiveness, however, is dependent upon the assumption that whatever a student knows about a particular subject was learned as a result of institutional processes such as classroom experiences (Astin, 1993). Students who perform well on end-of-course examinations may have knowledge of the subject prior to entering the classroom. Students who know nothing about the subject, although performing at an average or lower than average level on the end-of-course examination, may have actually experienced much learning as a result of the classroom experience.

Another commonly acknowledged indicator of effectiveness is the reputation of the college. Effectiveness based upon reputation may result simply from the college's rank in a particular hierarchy (Astin, 1993) such as the list of the best colleges published in Fortune 500. Such rankings, if
based upon the performance of outstanding graduates, may not reflect the effectiveness of the institution's academic program. These graduates may have been outstanding academic scholars upon entering the highly ranked institution. Although the educational program at the prestigious institution may have been similar to that of a less prestigious institution, the college is considered effective based upon the performance of its graduates.

Institutions may also be rated highly effective as a result of certain resource acquisitions; namely buildings and new or additional equipment, the number and quality of faculty publications and/or research, faculty who hold academic degrees from prestigious universities, and real estate holdings. Some institutions, however, are effective even when they do not get all the needed resources (Cameron, 1983), and some are judged ineffective even with an abundance of resources.

Both the reputational and resource measures of effectiveness for institutions "produce very similar rankings of institutions" (Astin, 1993, p. 6). Institutions that enjoy high reputational rankings are also able to attract faculty members who have received much publicity for
their research and publications. Highly qualified students are attracted to those universities and colleges that attract these faculty. These colleges also have more success in attracting monetary resources through endowments and from public and private sources due to the reputation of their faculty and students. "Reputation and resources, in short, tend to be mutually reinforcing" (Astin, 1993, p. 6).

Effectiveness measures based solely upon the reputation and resources of institutions, however, may not emphasize educational programs.

... opinion leaders often cite unfortunate experiences of their own offspring in leading universities: meager contact with faculty members, mathematics teachers who speak English poorly, indifferent critical evaluation of written work. . . Scant attention is given to the evaluation of teaching in the appointment and promotion process (Kennedy, 1992, p. 16).

Cunningham (1992) also verified concern about the quality of education in universities widely acclaimed for their contributions to research. Such concern "often centers on the lack of adequate commitment to and incentives
for teaching as opposed to scholarship, although there are also many concerns and controversies with respect to the nature of the curriculum" (p. 60).

Another theory of effectiveness is that of goal achievement (Cameron, 1983). Effectiveness measured by goal achievement, however, means little if goals are not met. An example of this measure of effectiveness follows: An institution established a goal to increase enrollment and, at the same time, reduce overall operating expenses. A plan was implemented. Enrollments; however, did not increase over the past year, operating costs were higher than ever, yet students and certain external agencies rated the institution effective in its delivery of education.

Goals may also be difficult to identify. "Consensus is often lacking about the goals, and ... there are few and generally poor measures of achievement of the goals" (Kells, 1988, p.5). Students have various reasons for entering college. They may enroll to complete degree requirements, for personal enrichment, to transfer to another college, or to learn or enhance certain skills. Whatever their goals, "a national effort should be undertaken to standardize
responses" (Seidman, 1993, p. 40) if institutions use data on student goals to demonstrate effectiveness.

Goals of individuals within the institution also may vary. Senior level administrators who have responsibility for fiscal resources may have reducing expenses as a major goal. Academic deans may have the purchase of additional equipment and hiring more faculty as major goals, while the president has increasing the foundation endowment as a major goal. Administrators of an organization or institution of higher education who become focused on attaining a particular "set of measurable institutional goals may become obdurate to change, to options or to alternate courses of action" (Romney, Bogen, & Micek, 1983, p. 83).

Another theory of institutional effectiveness is based upon the internal processes or the mechanisms of instructional delivery (Cameron, 1983). Internal processes may, however, operate efficiently; yet the institution is judged ineffective in the quality of support services or educational programs it offers. Further, inappropriate institutional goals may cause internal processes which are judged efficient and effective; but the institution is judged ineffective. The problem is not with the internal
processes, but with flaws in the goals function (Starbuck & Nystrom, 1983). Administrations of colleges succeed in processes to raise money or increase enrollments; however, the colleges still decline because goals were inappropriately identified (Cowan, 1993). "A change in one part of the system may not alter the whole system, even when its impact is felt throughout the organization" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p. 61).

On the other hand, internal processes may be poor, yet the institution is judged effective by its constituents and other external agencies (Cameron, 1983). Judgments of internal processes or operational effectiveness reflect the personal values, or perhaps political loyalties, of those persons judging them (Starbuck & Nystrom, 1983). Middle managers have a set of values used as criteria in judging operations or internal processes, top managers may have a different set of values as a basis of their judgment, and constituents may have another group of values they use. "The criteria used by different constituencies to define effectiveness often differ markedly, and spirited debates about which constituency's criteria are most valuable continue" (Cameron, 1983, p. 270). Faculty remain concerned
about what they teach, state legislatures about the protection of taxpayers, and employers about the skill level of the graduates they hire (Astin, 1993).

As indicated by the preceding examples of the various methods of evaluating institutional effectiveness, constructs of effectiveness are not only difficult to define, "... no one approach to effectiveness is inherently superior to another" (Cameron, 1983, p. 3). The impact of many variables on institutional effectiveness is unknown, and there is a lack of homogeneity among the criteria. Studies by organizational scientists who study institutional effectiveness have produced no "overarching framework, or categorization scheme that labels and distinguishes organizations one from another" (Cameron, 1983, p. 6). The lack of any common means to demonstrate effectiveness also concerned Seidman (1993); "currently, there is no comparable standard methodology to judge ... effectiveness" (p. 37).

"Effectiveness is similar to an unmapped terrain, where the responsibility lies with investigators to chart it" (Cameron & Whetton, 1983, p. 20). Judgments of effectiveness are subjective because they reflect the
personal values and perceptions of individuals, and the
criteria used by various individuals may be varied and
conflicting. Effectiveness, therefore, as a construct is
similar to other subjective concepts in the social sciences
such as motivation, leadership, job satisfaction, needs,
morale, and intelligence.

Reported factors affecting effectiveness may not
actually be those practiced. The "theories people hold in
their heads frequently do not match theories they act on"
(Cameron, 1983, p. 12). Values of strategic constituents
(students, legislatures, employers, or other users of the
institution's educational programs and services) may change,
thus changing the effectiveness criteria.

Environmental changes occur that may cause changes in
factors contributing to effectiveness. "In many colleges
the financial pressures have become so great that all other
aspects of college life are affected" (Parnell, 1990, p.
18). The environment, however, may not be as hostile as
individuals within the institution perceive it (Cameron,
1983), and environmental turbulence may not be associated
with decline of effectiveness. "This may be a result of the
environment being perceived to be more turbulent and hostile when personnel are dissatisfied" (Cameron, 1983, p. 103).

Another factor affecting the perception of an institution's effectiveness may be that the wrong constituency is identified. The institution may be forced to respond to one constituency, such as legislators who are perhaps the most powerful constituency. There may be multiple constituencies; degree-seeking students, the general public, business and industry, legislatures, and community leaders. Some, such as students, parents, and community leaders, may attempt to force the institution to focus its resources on academic development; for example, compensatory or remedial courses that are costly and labor intensive (Cohen & Brawer, 1989).

Governmental and other agencies may request the dedication of additional resources to research, and business and industry constituents promote job training. Some colleges even sell their services by leasing college land, contract education with businesses, or cooperative ventures with private enterprises (Cohen & Brawer, 1989).

The decision by college leaders to respond to all the demands, spreading resources among all to a limited degree,
or to respond well to one constituency at the expense of the others will affect the judgment of the degree to which the institution is considered effective. Thus, "effectiveness must be evaluated from the perspectives of different interested parties" (Seashore, 1983, p. 63); and the meaning of institutional effectiveness is varied from one institution to another as a result of its constituency.

Marcus, Leone, & Goldberg (1983) identified an extreme in establishing effectiveness measures. This extreme is to set no standards of excellence or effectiveness. "...The easiest path is to just pretend there is no bad news, or better yet, 'declare victory'--to redefine the bad news as not so bad by lowering the standard against which it is judged" (Senge, 1990, p. 153). Individual and institutional performance can also be justified by comparison of performance with other individuals and institutions whose performance is not as good (Marcus, et al., 1983). Thus, effectiveness and excellence exist in the minds of individuals.

Another extreme is to define effectiveness by comparison of characteristics to those of institutions with the highest academic (or other types of) standards. Marcus,
et al. (1983), however, identified what they perceived as a
more reasonable approach to effectiveness. That approach is
to clearly understand the institutional mission and role and
then identify specific characteristics and activities that
are necessary to fulfill that mission and role. "In
essence, the definition of organizational effectiveness
requires some explicit normative statement about what the
organization should be doing for whom" (Nord, 1983, p. 95).

Organizations and institutions of higher education have
been identified as social systems (Caplow, 1989; Dyer &
Dyer, 1989) with certain basic features. The institution
has a climate, a prevailing emotional state shared by the
individuals within the system (French, Bell, & Zawacki,
1989). The organization or institution also has an
established formal and informal communication network as
well as an organizational structure which allows the
division of labor within the organization and within
individual units of the organization. In addition, a
pattern of management is established with the leadership
style (such as Likert's participative, authoritative,
consultative, and collaborative styles) determined by those
individuals in top management positions. The organization
or institution also has a formal decision-making method or procedure.

The last, and most important, feature of an organization or institution is that it is comprised of individuals who function in a pattern of relationships. The individuals of an institution form a "federation of independent individuals who are linked by common interests. The 'link' is the set of norms necessary for the organization to operate" (Quinn & Cameron, 1988, p. 32).

The social system is shaped by the kind of people who make up the system, and organizations are "often the result of the actions of their employees" (Falsey, 1989, p. 59) or of individuals who are seeking to attain their own goals and ambitions (Van de Ven & Poole, 1988). Effective organizations are those in which the majority of the participants, members, and employees "perceive themselves as free to use the organization and its subsystems as instruments for their own ends (goals)" (Cummings, 1983, p. 197). Effectiveness, then, is defined by the opportunities provided by the organization to those who depend upon the organization.
Individuals with more investment, (i.e., experience, effort, and involvement in the institution) expect more influence in helping to define and judge the effectiveness of the institution (Cummings, 1983), because the success of the employee and the institution "go hand in hand" (Falsey, 1989, p. 38). Success of individual employees within the institution is determined by opportunities for growth and development as well as responsibility and control of their work (Argyris, 1964). Individual employees also "need to know that they are part of an overall plan and need to be able to identify their own unique contributions to its accomplishment" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p. 32).

As individuals and organizations mature, "maintaining morale and productivity requires a different set of norms and rewards that salute work well done, not a person's place in the hierarchy" (Senge, 1990, p. 101).

**Identification with Institutional Mission and Effectiveness**

Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Kurt Lewin, David McClelland, and other prominent psychologists were the primary impetus for the current emphasis upon the uniqueness of individuals (Vogt & Murrell, 1990). The focus for the
study of individuals within organizations in the 1950s and 1960s was upon motivation and its impact upon productivity. "The study of motivation and the focus on the individual's needs, wants, potential, and growth were made the foundation of major organizational changes" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p. 5).

Traditional, hierarchical management conditions were common; however, Block (1987) indicated that a revolution was taking place. There was a growing realization that tighter controls, greater pressure, more clearly defined jobs, and tighter supervision, have, in the last fifty years, run their course in their ability to give us the productivity gains we require to compete effectively . . . Attention is shifting to the need for employees to personally take responsibility for the success of our businesses if we hope to survive and prosper (p. xii).

Drucker, also indicated changes in organizational and management structures. "For 35 years, from the end of World War II until the early '80s, the trend ran toward more and more layers of management and more and more staff specialists. The trend now goes in the opposite direction"
The traditional, hierarchical organization is not designed "to provide for people's higher order needs, self-respect and self-actualization. The ferment in management will continue until organizations address these needs" (Senge, 1990, p. 140).

Individuals use four key concepts to define their relationships within organizations (Vogt & Murrell, 1990). The first concept is whether or not individuals are "making a difference" (p. 66); secondly, are competency levels adequate; thirdly, are contributions to goals significant; and fourthly, are there opportunities for individual growth? Organizations and institutions that provide opportunities for individuals to experience growth and self-actualization are also those in which employees become "an integral part of the system . . . willing to commit . . . to group and organizational goals" (Vogt & Murrell, 1990, p. 70).

As employees become more committed to group and organizational goals, identification with the organization increases; and "the greater the potential for both personal and organizational success" (Marshall, Pitera, Yorks, & DeBerry, 1994, p. 116). Lack of identification of individuals with a group within the institution, and
ultimately to the institution itself, promotes the feeling that individuals are not involved in achieving the goals of the college. This lack of involvement in the goals of the college contributes to employees feeling that "what they are doing becomes the end itself" (Robson, 1986, p. 18).

Institutional effectiveness links the performance of individuals and groups of individuals in the delivery of educational programs and educational support services to the statement of purpose or the mission of the institution (Nichols, 1991). Mission statements or statements of purpose represent the personality of the people who form the organization. Mission statements also provide a measurement to which people compare their daily efforts. Mission statements and statements of purpose linked to measurements of institutional effectiveness have become more common. Common components of institutional effectiveness identified by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) include (a) a sharpened statement of institutional mission and purpose, (b) identification of departmental or program results, and (c) the establishment of effective methods to determine whether or not the outcomes or results have been accomplished (Nichols, 1991). Once these components have
been identified, the institution must "maintain sufficient flexibility to permit revisions of the mission statement as the process unfolds" (Pratt, 1994, p. 156). This emphasis on the importance of the mission statement in the daily operation of the college prevents the statement from being reviewed every 10 years during self study processes, reworded, refiled as soon as the reaffirmation team leaves, and then forgotten for 10 more years. Yearly review of the mission statement as part of strategic planning "changes the mission or statement of purpose from a 'shelf-document' with little practical use to the basis for institutional action" (Nichols, 1991, p. 13).

Clearly stated mission statements provide the institution with a "good sense of itself" (Cowan, 1993, p. 4). Representation of all individuals and broad-based involvement in the development of the mission statement ensures that all individuals of the institution assume ownership and identification with the mission of the institution. This ownership and identification with the mission of the institution prevents individual employees in the institution from feeling as if they do not know "why they are doing what they are doing" (Robson, 1986, p. 19).
Each individual and group of individuals within the institution must reach consensus on the validity of the goals outlined in the mission statement and must agree that the goals represent the best interest of each individual and each group as well as the best interest of the institution (Nichols, 1991). The judgment of effectiveness is based upon an institution's mission and its definition of its purpose (Marcus, et al., 1983).

Mission statements also serve as standards against which institutional data used in the assessment of its staff, students, and programs are judged. Institutions are being challenged to prove their effectiveness by evaluating the goals and objectives of individual departments and programs to determine the connection of their intended goals and objectives to the mission of the institution (Nichols, 1991). Mission statements provide a philosophical foundation for individual employees; they clearly define the goals, the value system of the institution, and the "core principles of the organization" (Robson, 1986, p. 8).

Expanded statements of institutional purpose should reflect the unique characteristics of the institution and its diversity in mission (Calhoun, 1991). Community college
missions and philosophies differ extensively from those of four-year colleges (Seidman, 1993). The important characteristics of comprehensive community colleges should be recognized and used in the development of appropriate mission statements and thus of assessments of effectiveness (Calhoun, 1991; Hudgins, 1993; Seidman, 1993). However, failure to include all members of the institution in the development of expanded statements of purpose or mission statements will ensure that "the results of strategic planning will go unused, the institution will not grow and develop, and there will be no way to assess institutional effectiveness" (Nichols, 1991, p. 48).

The People of the Institution and Institutional Effectiveness

There is a "need for faith . . . in our people, for it is through them . . . that Excellence comes to pass " (Robson, 1991, p. 5). Organizations, businesses, and institutions are comprised of people, and the "human element cannot be eliminated" (Falsey, 1989, p. 33) from studies of institutional effectiveness.
Cameron (1978) identified morale as one of the domains of institutional effectiveness. The people of the institution make it unique (Falsey, 1989), and organizations and institutions may allow individuals to pursue their own agendas (Cummings, 1983). Initial goals of the institution are fostered by the people in power and their decisions affect all levels of activity in the institution (Schneider, 1983). Managers who perform the duties required of them but who do so at the expense of their co-workers are judged ineffective because their results are obtained at human cost (Kaplan, 1994).

All individuals of an institution have a sense of justice or of ethics (Ferris, 1994), a judgment about whether specific actions are right and whether the action fits into their view of the way things should be done. This sense of justice affects the morale of employees as they attempt to find their place in the organizational scheme. Employees may not follow the rules of ethical behavior themselves, but they know when those in power are not behaving ethically or when there is inconsistency in following internal policies. This knowledge affects their sense of pride in the institution, and causes them to
devalue achievements that may benefit the institution. If ethical behavior is not evident, employees may "waste time and energy trying to circumvent management decisions" (Ferris, 1994, p. 219-220).

For individual groups, and ultimately their organizations, to be effective, Cummings (1983) stated that the following must occur:

1. Individuals must believe in the fairness of the "system" through which rewards are distributed.

2. Individuals must believe reward systems are equitable when comparing outcomes to inputs across groups.

3. Individuals must believe that performance will lead to rewards.

4. Individuals must believe personal ability and/or motivation is an important cause of performance differences and will not be constrained by technology, organizational design, or managerial style.

5. Individuals must believe reward distributions can be accumulated over time. (p. 201-202.)
Other basic elements of good institutional morale include the recognition of the dignity of individual employees by enabling professional growth within the organization, providing opportunities for individual achievement, ensuring open communication, and using a fair and honest appraisal and reward system (Falsey, 1989; Litwin & Stringer, 1968). These elements contribute to feelings of self-worth and of responsibility and of contribution to the institution. "An organization and its employees if at odds with each other guarantees difficult times for both" (Falsey, 1989, p. 59).

An essential part of Taylor's scientific management principles and Adam Smith's economic prescription for success was that people were dispensable (Mahesh, 1993). In the era of the 1990s; however, individual skills, innovation, knowledge of the institution and its customers, and the mastery of information unique to the college make people indispensable. "As technology becomes the common ground for all players, people make the final difference between success and failure. . . ." (Barnett, Gevehe & Shell, 1989, p. 62).
Schneider (1983) also indicated that the studies of effectiveness "must pay careful attention to the attraction, selection, interaction patterns, and withdrawal processes of people" (p. 35). Institutions attract, retain, and promote individuals who have similar interests to those of its leaders. Effectiveness, then, may perhaps be measured by the socialization process of the newcomers. These newcomers should be interviewed to determine their perceptions of the institution's goals and direction since they may perhaps be more "sensitive to where current practices and procedures suggest the organization is going because they need this kind of information as a basis for their own adjustment process" (Schneider, 1983, p. 50). Data on expenditures of money, energy, and manpower on the recruitment, attraction, and retention of people who contribute to the mission of the institution are vital in assessing organizational effectiveness.

Individuals and organizations are "systems of feelings, emotions, attitudes, beliefs, experiences, and prejudices" (Williams, 1993, p. 163). The successful organizations of the future will be those that seek a common ground, or congruence, with the people within them.
Empowerment, functionality, and congruence are based on accepting the challenges, risks, differences, nuances, and unique qualities that exist in each person, situation, and organization. Demanding static performance, lack of change, or maintenance of historical patterns defeats the potential to be effective, creative, and functional (Williams, 1993, p. 165).

Summary

As the review of the literature has shown, institutional effectiveness is vague and not defined by objective or empirical measures. Effectiveness measures using outcomes assessment, reputation, and resource attainment may be inappropriate in all situations among all colleges.

No one model of institutional effectiveness is applicable to all institutions. However, there is one effectiveness measure which can be used at any institution. This measure is the use of the mission of individual institutions to determine effectiveness. Researchers indicated that the linkage of effectiveness indicators to
the mission of community colleges is a more equitable measure of effectiveness due to the unique mission of each institution (AACC, 1994). This is particularly true for comprehensive community colleges whose missions include job training, developmental education, and community service programs as well as the traditional freshman and sophomore academic programs. Effectiveness measures that do not take into consideration unique characteristics of each institution may inadequately reflect the institution's ability to provide quality educational and educational support programs.

The second focus of the literature review was the "people" element or component of institutional effectiveness. Because individuals comprise each institution, the effect those individuals have on the programs offered, the students who sit in the classroom or use other services offered on campus (i.e., the library, student development services, and business services), and on other constituencies must be studied to obtain an accurate picture of the effectiveness of institutions.

Of primary importance in determining the effect individuals have on institutional effectiveness is to study
the impact of employee morale upon the college climate. Employee morale is measured by the indicators of job satisfaction for faculty and staff.

The perception of ownership of individual employees in the institution's mission and statement of purpose is also important in the study of institutional effectiveness. Employees who do not feel valued for their contribution to the mission of the institution may contribute to ineffective internal processes thus inhibiting the delivery of a quality educational program and educational support services.
The case study method of research is useful when one "needs to understand some special people, particular problem, or unique situation in great depth, and where one can identify cases rich in information" (Patton, 1990, p. 54). There are several types of case studies (Borg & Gall, 1989): (a) Historical case studies are studies that track the development of organizations over time. (b) Observational case studies are those in which groups of people, such as those in classrooms, are observed over a long period of time. (c) Oral histories are also case studies. Extensive interviews of one person are conducted to collect first-person narratives. (d) Another method of case study research is situational analysis. All the major participants in a particular event are interviewed to obtain their perceptions of the event. (e) The last type of case study identified by Borg & Gall (1989) is the clinical case study. This type of study focuses on one particular type of individual, such as one who has a learning disability.
The situational type of case study was selected for this study since situational studies allow the researcher to explore a specific situation, such as the climate of an institution. Situational analysis is an in-depth study of a particular event "from the viewpoint of all the major participants" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 403).

In addition, the selection of this method was a result of the desire by the researcher to understand how the data collected by climate surveys were used in the reaffirmation or reaccreditation process. Climate survey data may also be used in the development of a "broad-based system to determine institutional effectiveness" (Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1995, p. 8). Therefore, the researcher was interested in studying whether or not climate survey data were used as the basis for improving internal systems or processes and ultimately the institution's effectiveness in the delivery of educational programs.

Institutions for this study were selected based upon the following three criteria. Each institution had to have: (a) completed the self-study process within the last five years; (b) used a climate survey during the self-study or
reaffirmation process, and (c) administered the same climate survey instrument.

Because the researcher was employed in the North Carolina Community College System, the initial search for institutions meeting these three criteria began within that system. A listing of all the community colleges in North Carolina and their scheduled reaffirmation date was obtained from the North Carolina Community College System. Institutions that had completed the reaffirmation process within the last five years were selected from this list. Fifteen institutions were contacted by telephone to determine whether a climate survey was administered in the reaffirmation process. All had used different climate survey instruments. The search for institutions that met the criteria was broadened to community colleges located in other states.

About the same time the researcher began contacting community colleges located in North Carolina, she was appointed to serve on a continuous improvement team at the institution at which she was employed. The continuous improvement team grew from concern generated during the reaffirmation process and resulting recommendations from the
reaffirmation committee of the accrediting agency for this institution. The researcher was selected by the continuous improvement team to locate climate survey instruments. The climate survey instrument ultimately selected was the Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) published by G. A. Baker, III, of North Carolina State University in Raleigh (Appendix A).

During the process of coordinating the administration of the PACE survey at the institution at which she was employed, the researcher determined that the PACE survey had been administered at higher education institutions throughout the United States. Baker provided a listing of 27 institutions that had administered a climate survey within the last five years (coincided with the completion of the self-study within the last five years), the type of climate survey administered, and the date the survey was administered.

Telephone contacts were made to the 15 community colleges that had administered the PACE survey instrument. Of the 15 colleges contacted, only six had administered the PACE during the self-study or reaffirmation process. These
were selected for further study, and three institutions agreed to participate in the study.

The researcher sought permission from each community college to study the data provided for information pertaining to institutional climate, such as employee morale and perception of employee ownership in the mission of the colleges, and to publish the results (Appendix B). Employee morale is comprised of multiple factors such as job satisfaction, perception of input into the decision making process, the ability of the employee to influence the direction of the college, and the perception of the employee regarding communication of timely and necessary information.

Fictional names were assigned to each of the institutions to ensure confidentiality. Middle States Community College, located in a small town approximately 26 miles from a large, industrial city, was established in 1963. Midwestern Community College, a suburban campus located approximately 100 miles from a major Midwestern city, was founded in 1967. Farming and industry were the primary employers within the service area of the College. Northeastern Community College, an urban campus in a very large northeastern city, was established in 1972.
Positivist or scientific research is "concerned with surface events or appearances" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 30); and statistical studies manipulate and measure relationships between certain painstakingly selected and narrowly defined variables. "Statistical data provide a succinct and parsimonious summary of major patterns, while select case studies provide depth, detail, and individual meaning" (Patton, 1990, p. 17). Case study research also "gathers data on multiple aspects of the setting under study in order to assemble a comprehensive and complete picture of the social dynamic of the particular situation or program" (Patton, 1990, p. 50).

For this study, multiple aspects or sources of information for each institution were the PACE survey results, institutional self-study reports, reaffirmation team reports, college catalogs, and interviews conducted with selected employees of each college (see Appendix D for interview questions).

The employees selected for an interview from each college were the president, all the vice presidents, a representative sample of deans, associate deans, professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors,
professional staff, and nonprofessional staff. Faculty and staff listings in the catalogs from each college were used to ensure the selection of representatives from all employee levels of the colleges. College catalogs also were used to ensure that employees selected to interview had been employed more than one year and were cognizant of the climate survey and whether or not the results were used in any change initiatives. Additionally, college catalogs were used to select employees representing each function or employee group at each college thus ensuring a broad-based representation of employees.

Letters requesting an appointment for a telephone interview were mailed to these selected individuals in early July, 1996 (Appendix C). Follow-ups to nonrespondents were conducted using both e-mail and telephone calls.

PACE Survey

The PACE survey is the result of extensive work by George A. Baker III on a survey to measure institutional climate (Commitment to Excellence, CES) developed by John Reouche and Baker at the University of Texas in Austin in 1987. The PACE Survey instrument has been administered at
more than 40 community colleges since 1988 (Baker, 1992).

"In previous studies, the PACE instrument has shown a coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of .9663. This high coefficient indicates that the PACE instrument provides a reliable measure of the college environment" (Baker, 1995. p. ii).

The survey consisted of 56 items or statements divided into categories reflecting those constructs or factors that impact employee morale and thus institutional climate. These climate factors were formal influence or leadership, collaboration, communication, organizational structure, work design or job satisfaction, and student focus. The survey instrument used a Likert-type scale. Survey respondents selected from five possible responses to each item on the survey. These responses range from "Very Satisfied" to "Very Dissatisfied." Other ratings of items were "Satisfied," "Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied," and "Dissatisfied." Survey data from all three institutions were used to obtain a "picture" of employee morale.

The version of the survey used at the first college selected for this study contained 54 total items that were divided into five climate factors or categories that
affected morale and institutional climate. These five factors were: (a) formal influence, (b) organizational structure (c) communication, (d) collaboration, and (e) work design. Another climate factor or category was added prior to the time the survey was conducted at the other two colleges selected for this study. This climate factor was student focus.

Each climate factor contained between eight to 10 items or statements. Employee responses to the survey items were used to compile the mean score, sometimes called a priority index score, for each of the items on the survey. The priority index score or mean was represented by a range from 1 to 4.50, with 4.50 representing the "ideal" mean for the PACE survey instrument. Each item in the six categories was ranked by the priority index or mean score in descending order; the items with means lower than 3.50 in each climate factor or category were identified as areas in which change was needed or the priorities for change for that climate factor as well as the highest priorities for change college-wide.

Survey results were interpreted using "a scientific management model developed by Likert (1967) and adapted to..."
the PACE format" (Baker, 1995, p. ii). The four leadership or management systems identified by Likert were (a) the exploitative authoritative, (b) the benevolent authoritative, (c) the consultative, and (d) the participative. The exploitative authoritative, or System 1, model corresponds to a 1.00 mean for the PACE Climate Survey. The participative or System 4, model corresponds to a 4.50 mean for the PACE Climate Survey.

System 1 represents a structured, task-oriented, and highly authoritative leadership management style based on the notion that followers are inherently lazy and that, to make them productive, the manager must "keep after them" constantly. In contrast, System 4 is characterized by a leadership style that is relationship- or person-oriented, mutually trusting, and one in which the administrator has complete confidence in the followers. This style 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 (Baker, 1994, p. ii).
Likert also found that the System 4 or participative model usually produced a better environment. Additionally, the System 4 model does not occur naturally, but is a "climate to be sought through planning and participation" (Baker, 1994, p. iii).

The "ideal" mean of 4.50 for the PACE Climate Survey corresponds to the participatory management model. The spread between the individual college means and the "ideal" indicates the amount of improvement needed for that item or climate factor.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The data from which the information was obtained to respond to the research questions were compiled from several sources. The items for change in each of the six climate factors or categories of the PACE survey were identified by ranking the items by mean or the priority index score in ascending order; the top priorities for change in each institution along with self study and reaffirmation team reports were compiled for research question four. Data from PACE survey used to identify the top priorities for change informed research question one. Research question two also
used data from the survey in addition to the reaffirmation team report. The college-wide climate mean and information from the institutional self-study and reaffirmation team reports of each college contributed to the response for research question three. Employee responses to interview questions (Appendix D) were used for research questions six and seven. For research question five, interview data along with the self-study data from each college formed the basis for the response.

Reaffirmation team recommendations and interview data were used to complete the picture of the status of the institutions. Interview responses were compared to the survey results to enhance the picture of each institution. Comparisons were also used to determine the perception of the employees regarding climate survey data and its value to the institution. Additionally, reaffirmation team and college self-study reports were compared to the climate survey data to determine whether each method identified similar problem areas within the institution.

A pilot study was conducted using the interview questions at a university that had also used the PACE Climate Survey Instrument. As a result of the pilot study,
the original eight questions were changed to enhance data collection. The revised interview questions used in this study are shown in Appendix D.

Structured interviews were conducted with selected employees at each institution to allow a more indepth study of the extent to which the data collected via the survey instrument, the self-study team report, and reaffirmation team report were used in institutional planning. At two of the colleges, all interviewed employees were cognizant of the priorities for change that were identified by the PACE Climate Survey. At Northeastern Community College, however, two of the four employees interviewed did not remember the survey or the results. Copies of the priorities for change were mailed to these two interviewees prior to their interview.

Catalogs from each college were used to identify the employees to interview. Those selected to interview were the president, vice presidents of academic and student affairs, a representative sample of the deans, faculty members and support staff. Catalogs were also utilized to ensure that interviews would be conducted with
representatives of all employee groups at each college, thus ensuring a broad-based representation of employees.

Reports from the institutional self-study and the reaffirmation team for each institution were also compared to the results of the climate surveys for each institution to determine whether each instrument identified the same problems or the same areas in need of improvement. Special attention was given to those areas that affected the functions, processes, or core activities of the institution, since these are the mechanisms through which the educational program (curriculum) and educational support services are delivered. Educational support services includes the library and student development services.

Structured telephone interviews were conducted with the selected individuals of each institution to determine whether or not climate surveys were useful in identifying areas in which improvements were needed. The extent to which the information generated by the surveys was used in strategic planning and the use of climate surveys for early identification of problems were also studied.
Validity and Reliability

Establishing internal validity or the extent a researcher's results "are congruent with reality--is addressed by using triangulation, checking interpretations with individuals interviewed or observed, . . . asking peers to comment on emerging findings. . ." (Merriam, 1988, p. 183). For this study, employee interviews were used to verify interpretations of the data. Additionally, all four sources of data from one of the colleges (the PACE Climate Survey results, the self-study report, the reaffirmation team report, and interview data) and the researcher's summaries of the data obtained from each of these sources were reviewed by a peer of the researcher (Appendix E) to verify data interpretation. Peer review ensured objectivity in reporting data and also ensured that researcher bias, if evident, was identified and reported.

External validity or the generalizability of case study research can be improved by three methods (Merriam, 1988). These are (a) providing detailed descriptions of the context of the study or an audit trail, (b) describing how typical the case is to similar cases to enable readers to make comparisons to their own case, and (c) conducting a cross-
Reliability is determined by assuring the dependability of the results. "Rather than demanding that outsiders get the same results, one wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense--they are consistent and dependable" (Merriam, 1988, p. 172).

Merriam lists several techniques that can be used to ensure the dependability of research results. One of these is the audit trail which is a detailed description of "how data were collected, how categories were derived . . . the researcher should present their methods in such detail 'that other researchers can use the original report as an operating manual by which to replicate the study'" (Goetz & LeCompte in Merriam, 1988, p. 173).

The detailed description of the methodology used in this study was discussed earlier in this chapter.

Descriptions of each of the institutions studied are contained in Chapter Four. Summaries of each of the sources of data for each college are contained in Chapter Five. These data sources are the self-study report, the
reaffirmation team or accrediting agency team report, the PACE climate survey, and interviews conducted with selected employees of each of the colleges. Chapter Five also contains descriptions of the differences in climate at each college as indicated by the survey results and the extent to which climate survey data were used in planning to initiate change at each college.

Comparisons of the three institutions to show variances in how each used the data from the climate survey are contained in Chapter Six. Additionally, the research questions are restated and answered in Chapter Six. Chapter Seven contains conclusions and implications for further research.
CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTIONS OF EACH COLLEGE

An understanding of an institution is difficult to achieve without some knowledge of the system within which it operates and by which it is governed. "Detailed description of particulars is needed so that the reader can vicariously experience the setting of the study" (Merriam, 1988, p. 199). A "detailed description" of each institution in the study, its system of governance, climate, environment, and its mission follows. As indicated previously, fictitious names were used for each institution to ensure anonymity.

Middle States Community College

In 1961, the state general assembly enacted legislation that authorized county governments to create community colleges subject to the approval of a new state agency; the community college board. In 1963, authority for the community colleges was transferred from the community college board to the state board of regents. This board of regents is responsible for planning and coordinating the
state's public and private college and university system and the state-assisted two-year colleges.

In July, 1963, Middle States Community College was granted a charter to serve the higher education needs of the county. The College became the second public community college in the state; and in 1966, moved from its rented facilities to a suburban location on a 250 acre campus in a small city approximately 26 miles from a large metropolitan area. There were 15 buildings located on the campus. Enrollment at the time of the study was 7,753; and between 30 and 40% of students received some form of financial assistance. There were 339 total faculty members; however, only 114 of these were employed full-time. The College offered approximately 33 degree programs including the pre-liberal arts programs. Middle States Community College guaranteed transferability to specific four-year institutions within the area.

The primary mission of the College was to enhance and enrich the quality of life of its students and the community by encouraging learning. The mission statement also ensured that the educational programs and services were accessible, affordable, and of the highest quality. Middle States
Community College also was committed to providing career, technical, transfer, and continuing education programs.

In addition to programs that offered graduates opportunities for employment or transfer or both, Middle States Community College was committed to teaching all students to read with comprehension, to listen discriminately, and to apply critical thinking and analytic skills. Additionally, the College was committed to participatory decision making, collaboration, and cooperation in its teaching and administrative capacities.

**Midwestern Technical College**

The state system of which this institution is a part was established in 1911 by the legislature to meet four objectives: (a) to provide continuation schools for students aged 14 to 16 who had quit high school; (b) to provide academic education for adults; (c) to provide apprenticeship training; and (d) to provide vocational training. The legislation that led to the establishment of this state education system was "the first comprehensive continuation school legislation in the country" (Tollefson & Fountain, 1992, p. 237). These centers of education were
called industrial education centers, and the state law required every community of 5,000 or more to establish a local board of industrial education.

Industrial centers of education were changed to vocational schools in the late 1930s; and these vocational schools became the primary means of training for national defense during the 1940s. Program offerings included aircraft maintenance, shipbuilding, light manufacturing, sheet metal, chemicals, ammunition, military supply, and other such training programs related to the war effort. After World War II, vocational program offerings were expanded to train veterans for employment in both the private and public sectors.

During the 1950s and 1960s, rapid expansion of industry resulted in increased demand for vocational and technical training. During the 1960s, legislation was enacted that broadened the scope of programs offered and directed that vocational and technical education become part of the higher education system. In 1967, the institution selected for this study, Midwestern Technical College, was founded.

Midwestern Technical College was governed by an elected district board. This board ensured that the vocational,
technical, and adult education provided was guided by lay people knowledgeable about the skills essential to fulfill the employment needs of the district. Board membership included three employers, three employees, two additional (at large) members, and one superintendent of a school system within the institution's district. (The state board was required to include one farmer in its membership.)

At the time of this study, Midwestern Technical College had an enrollment of 2,893 students. The institution was located in the suburbs of a small, Midwestern city 100 miles from a major metropolitan area. There were 900 faculty employed at this institution; however, only 400 were full-time. The unique structure of program offerings, the various schedule of classes within certain programs, the apprenticeship programs, regional centers, and credit courses taught at other off-campus locations (such as 12 hours of educational instruction students in the Farm Business and Production Program may complete on their own farms) may explain the large number of faculty.

Programs offered at Midwestern Technical College appeared representative of those offered at most technical
or community colleges; however, the institution was not authorized to offer the pre-liberal arts college transfer program. (Only three colleges in the state were authorized to offer a transfer program equivalent to the first two years of a liberal arts baccalaureate degree.)

More than 60 associate degree programs, technical diploma programs, and certificate programs were offered on the main campus. Seventeen programs of study were also offered on a satellite campus. The College also had five regional centers that did not offer full curricula; however, students could complete certain credit courses which did not require laboratories or extensive equipment. Regional centers also were allowed to offer various developmental courses.

Students enrolled at either of the main campuses or at any of the regional centers could follow various academic calendars. The College had a diverse scheduling pattern that accommodated an array of credit classes. Curricula contained courses that could be completed in 6 weeks, 9 weeks, 12 weeks, or in a semester. Multiple entry and exit points were available for courses completed in less than a semester.
The academic calendar students followed depended upon the program in which they were enrolled. Students enrolled in associate degree level programs generally followed the semester calendar for two or more years, and technical diploma programs could be 12 to 48 weeks in length. Both associate degree and diploma programs might also include certain courses that could be completed in six weeks. The college, in an effort to accommodate those students who were employed full-time, also offered some programs only at certain times of the year. One example of this type of accommodation was the farm operation diploma program that was only offered three days a week from mid-November until mid-April. This schedule enabled those individuals employed full-time in farming to attend classes.

The 18-week semester sessions had a program emphasis (such as diesel equipment mechanics) and also had 6- or 9-week classes that concentrated on specific topics. The Farm Business and Production Management Program was offered only on a part-time basis and required six years to complete; however, students could receive up to 12 hours of instruction on their own farms. Students enrolled in programs that contained classes of 6 weeks, 9 weeks, 12
weeks, or 18 weeks might begin on the same day of the term.

Apprenticeship programs were also available through this institution, and applications for some of these programs were handled by the institution's district office. Other apprenticeship program applications were processed through various offices on or off campus. For certain apprenticeship programs (such as industrial electrician), several years of employment in the industry were required before admission into the program was allowed. Admission into the program might depend upon seniority status within a plant; however, each company or industry had its own requirements for entry into these apprenticeship programs. Individuals who were interested in apprenticeship programs were required to initiate contact with industries.

Students were admitted into certain apprenticeship programs by Joint Apprenticeship Committees that were comprised of employers and employees in a specific field. Apprentices in these programs (such as construction trades) were indentured to a joint apprenticeship committee for their trade and were subindentured to individual employers. The associate dean for apprenticeships, located on the main
campus, coordinated information and application procedures for these programs.

Individual apprenticeship programs contained various types of related academic educational requirements. These academic courses, as well as the formal theoretical component, were taught on the main campus or on the branch campus of the institution. The length of these apprenticeship programs varied from three to six years. Individuals interested in admission into an apprenticeship program increased their chances for selection by completing academic courses prior to making application for admission into the program.

The variety of curricula and innovative scheduling of classes embodied the mission of the institution, its vision and statements of purpose. The mission simply stated that the institution will provide education and training to help individuals reach their full potential and to build and maintain an effective work force that supports the growth and stability of the community.
Northeastern Community College

Northeastern Community College was a member of a state system composed of 27 public colleges and universities. All colleges and universities of the state were governed by the board of regents of higher education; however, the community college system had its separate board until 1981 when it became part of the board of regents.

The development of the community college system of this state was relatively late; the recommendation that a community college system be established to provide diversity and access to higher education was written in March, 1958. It was not accepted by the general court until August, 1958, and enabling legislation was signed by the governor of the state in October, 1958. Between the fall of 1960 and 1965, nine of the 15 community colleges were established. Northeastern Community College was founded in 1972; and at the time of the study, the College had an undergraduate enrollment of 3,400. Eighty-five percent of the student population received some form of financial aid. At the time of the study, the College employed 147 faculty; however, only 65 were full-time employees.
Northeastern Community College had two campuses. The main campus was situated on 12.3 acres only minutes from the downtown area of a large city. The satellite campus, located in the heart of the academic community near the major university campus, was originally founded in 1941 as a technical training school for the city. The technical training school was merged with Northeastern Community College in 1984. Together, the College facilities included six buildings which, in addition to classrooms, housed laboratories, an on-site day care center, an athletic center and track, and a 500 seat theater.

The College offered a cross-registration program that enabled students, at no extra cost, to complete advanced courses at area universities. This opportunity also ensured a smooth, nonthreatening transition for students wishing to transfer into any major university system.

The mission statement of Northeastern Community College directed the College to provide an opportunity for access to a college education consistent with individual interests and aptitudes of the students. The College's mission specifically promised educational opportunities to those who historically have been deprived of a quality education. In
addition, the mission of the College was to provide
preparation for those entering business and industry as well
as for those seeking transferability of courses.

The mission statement of Northeastern was unique in
that it also stated that the multi-cultural nature of the
population of the city and the College will be addressed by
offering, within the associate degree programs, courses that
emphasized the cultures represented. One of these special
topics courses was a Caribbean Topics program. This program
was an in-depth examination of a particular Caribbean
society and its relationship with other Caribbean societies
as well as with the United States. Also included were study
tours of two to four weeks which allowed students to visit
major historical and cultural sites and to attend economic
and political lectures. An appropriate language course was
a prerequisite for the study tour program.

As a result of its mission to reflect the interests of
its ethnic and culturally diverse population, Northeastern
Community College also offered courses in Latin American
studies, black studies, African history, and Spanish. Other
program offerings at the College included those that
prepared graduates for employment in businesses and
industries in the area and for transfer into area universities.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARIES OF DATA FOR ALL THREE INSTITUTIONS

This chapter contains summaries of data from each of the four sources from the three institutions selected for this study. These data sources were (a) the PACE Climate Survey, (b) the self-study report, (c) the reaffirmation team or reaccrediting agency team report, and (d) interviews conducted with selected employees.

Summary of Data From Middle States Community College

Middle States community College was the second public community college established in its state. At the time of this study, 7,753 students were enrolled and the College had 911 full-time and part-time employees. Of the four sources of data for Middle States Community College, the first summarized was the PACE Climate Survey.

PACE Climate Survey

The PACE Climate Survey was conducted at Middle States Community College (MSCC) in September, 1992 prior to the beginning of the self-study process for reaccreditation.
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As indicated in Chapter Three, respondents rated each item for each climate factor on a five-point Likert scale. Survey results were interpreted based upon a scientific model developed by Likert in 1967 (Baker, 1995) that identified four leadership or organizational systems. These systems were (a) the exploitative authoritative system (corresponding to a 1.00 on the five-point scale—a System 1 organization), (b) the benevolent authoritative system (2.00 on the five-point scale—a System 2 organization), (c) the consultative system (3.00 on the five-point scale—a System 3 organization), and (d) the participative system (4.00 on the five-point scale or a System 4 organization).

The System 4 or participative system is the "ideal" system and is the system that produces greater productivity, better job satisfaction, communication and overall climate. This system does not occur naturally; however, it is the goal for leaders committed to improving an organization (Baker, 1994).

The PACE survey explored the perceptions of 201 MSCC employees (62% of the full-time employees) on six factors that affect college climate. Part-time employees did not complete the survey. These factors were the (a) formal
influence, (b) organizational structure, (c) collaboration, (d) work design, (e) communication, and (f) student focus. Employees rated each item for each climate factor on the five-point Likert scale.

Results were computed for each employee group at the College. The employee groups were the faculty; administrative and support (professional and technical support--the president, vice presidents, division directors, and professional and technical support); administrative (no professional and technical support employees were included in this group); and support staff (secretarial, maintenance, cashiers, mail clerks, security officers, groundskeepers, etc.).

The averages or means for all the items comprising each factor affecting college climate were compared to national averages. Priorities for change were identified inversely by the lowest scoring item for each of the climate factors. Items with means less than 3.50 were those identified by the PACE Climate Survey results as the top priorities for change or the ones in greatest need of change. The highest score was indicative of a lower priority for change.
Formal Influence. The formal influence or leadership factor of college climate contained eight items. For the faculty, the two highest-rated items had the same mean ($M = 3.8$). These two items were (a) the amount of confidence the administration had in the ability of the faculty to perform in an excellent manner and (b) the extent faculty felt free to seek the information they needed. The administrative and support group and the support staff group ranked the extent they felt free to seek the information they needed as their highest ($M = 3.9$, $M = 3.7$ respectively). The administrative group ranked as highest the extent they were encouraged to develop creative and innovative ideas ($M = 4.6$). The highest ranking item college-wide was the extent to which employees felt free to seek information or assistance from the administration ($M = 3.9$).

All four employee groups ranked as lowest (or the item most in need of change) the extent they were assisted by the administration in improving their teaching or work. The groups and their means were (a) faculty ($M = 2.8$), (b) support staff ($M = 3.1$), (c) administrative and support staff ($M = 3.3$), (d) administrative staff ($M = 4.0$). The the college-wide mean for this item was 3.1.
The college-wide formal influence or leadership mean score for the College was 3.6. The national average for this factor was 3.35.

**Organizational Structure.** The next climate factor on the PACE survey was the organizational structure or decision making processes. This factor, which contained 10 items, measured the extent of involvement employees had in the decision making processes. The faculty, administrative and support staff, and the support staff employee groups all ranked the quality of decisions made by their work group as the highest item ($M = 3.7$, $M = 3.8$, $M = 3.7$ respectively). The administrative group had the extent of involvement in the decisions that affect their work ranked highest ($M = 4.5$). College-wide, the highest ranked item was the quality of decisions made by individual work groups ($M = 3.7$).

All employee groups rated the extent to which they were involved in decisions that affected them personally as the lowest. The groups and their means were (a) faculty ($M = 3.2$), (b) administrative and support ($M = 2.9$), (c) administrative ($M = 4.3$), and (d) support staff, ($M = 2.6$).
The college-wide mean on the organizational structure climate factor was 3.4. The national average was 3.22.

**Communication.** The communication factor of college climate contained eight items. Of these eight items, two employee groups ranked as highest the extent the administration willingly shared important information. These two groups were the faculty and administrative staff \((M = 3.4, M = 4.6, \text{ respectively})\). Administrative and support staff had two items tied for their highest ranking \((M = 3.8)\): (a) the usefulness of information supporting their work, and (b) the extent administration communicated positive expectations of their work. Support staff ranked as their highest item the usefulness of information supporting their work \((M = 3.8)\). College-wide, the highest ranked item was the extent administration communicated positive expectations of teaching or work \((M = 3.5)\).

The usefulness of the information received to support teaching was the lowest ranked item (or the top priority for change) for faculty \((M = 2.9)\). Administrative staff ranked as lowest the extent the quality of information received supported learning and teaching \((M = 4.2)\). Support staff
and the administrative and support staff employee groups both ranked lowest the extent administration willingly shared important information \((M = 3.2, M = 3.4,\) respectively). College-wide, three items tied for lowest \((M = 3.4)\); (a) the extent the quality of information received supported teaching and learning, (b) the usefulness of the information to support teaching or work, and (c) the extent administration willingly shared important information. Although these priorities for change for three employee groups exceeded the national average \((3.21)\), a comparison to the 4.50 ideal system \((Baker, 1994)\) indicated improvement was needed.

College-wide, the communication mean for MSCC was 3.4. The national average was 3.21.

**Collaboration.** The collaboration factor of college climate contained eight items. Faculty, administrative and support, and support staff groups all ranked as highest the level of cooperation that existed within their departments \((M = 3.7, M = 3.8, M = 3.8,\) respectively). For the administrative group, the extent the administration inspired them with a sense of purpose ranked highest \((M = 4.6)\). The
college-wide highest ranking item was the level of cooperation within departments (M = 3.8).

All employee groups were consistent in their ranking of the lowest item in the collaboration climate factor. This item was the extent cooperation existed across the various academic departments of the College. The means for each employee group were: (a) faculty (M = 3.0), (b) support staff (M = 3.0), (c) administrative and support staff (M = 3.1), and (d) administrative staff (M = 3.4). (Baker, 1994, indicated that a mean of 4.50 represents an "ideal" system. No college completing this survey averaged 4.5 on every category; however, some colleges might average 4.5 in some climate factors for some employee groups.)

College-wide, the mean for collaboration was 3.4. The national average was 3.37.

**Work Design.** The fifth factor in the climate survey was work design which contained nine items. In this factor, the highest ranking item for all employee groups was the extent employees believed their personality and temperament matched the professional demands of their jobs. The employee groups and their scores were (a) faculty (M = 4.4),
(b) administrative and support staff \((M = 4.3)\), (c) administrative staff \((M = 4.6)\), and (d) support staff \((M = 4.2)\).

For faculty, the item with the lowest mean (or the top priority for change) was the extent of satisfaction with the expenditure of energy necessary to accomplish the job \((M = 3.2)\). The administrative and support staff employee and the support staff employee groups ranked as lowest the extent they felt secure in their position \((M = 2.9, M = 2.8, \text{ respectively})\). For the administrative employee group, two items tied for lowest \((M = 3.5)\). These were (a) the extent of satisfaction with the level of energy needed to accomplish the job, and (b) the extent of perceived security in the job.

The college-wide score for work design or job satisfaction climate factor was 3.7. The national average was 3.55.

*Student Focus.* The version of the PACE climate survey used by MSCC in 1992 did not contain the student focus factor of college climate. This section was added prior to
the administration of the survey at the other two colleges in this study.

Thirteen college-wide priorities for change were identified by MSCC employee responses on the PACE climate survey. These priorities for change are shown in Table 1.

The overall mean or average for all employees on all factors affecting climate for Middle States Community College was 3.61 and the national average was 3.41. Although the College was above the national average on overall climate, the ideal overall mean for this survey is 4.50 which indicates a climate of open, participatory governance (Baker, 1995). Items with means below 3.5 were identified as the top priorities for change.

MSCC added an additional segment to the PACE Climate Survey. This segment was designed to allow employees to rank on a five-point scale their perceptions of the "ideal" for each item in each factor. Although national averages are important, perhaps the most important is the comparison of the "ideal" as determined by employees to the actual mean. The difference in the "ideal" as defined by employee rankings and the mean was the actual amount of change employees perceived should occur. The factor in which MSCC
### TABLE 1.

**MIDDLE STATES COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of involvement in decisions personally affecting employee</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation exists across various academic departments</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee assisted by administration in improving work</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards match quality of work</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfied with security of position</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of satisfaction in energy needed to complete job</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of information supports work</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information received supports work</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration inspires sense of purpose</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration uses/supports innovative ideas</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration supports professional development</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration influences professional growth and development</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration willingly shares important information</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
obtained the largest gap or spread was in the collaboration factor. The college-wide mean for collaboration was 3.4, and employees believed the mean should be 4.7.

The college-wide mean on all factors was 3.61, and the "ideal" mean as defined by both employees and the PACE survey was 4.5.

Although the results of the survey indicated that most employee groups had positive perceptions of the College, of its governance, and of their roles within each, there were areas of concern. The identification of these areas of needed change assisted the leaders of the College in identifying methods and processes for improvement.

**Self-Study Recommendations**

The organizational structure of Middle States Community College was streamlined soon after the arrival of its current president (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 26). Three deans positions were combined into two vice president positions, and the President's Cabinet was eliminated as the operational decision making structure. The President's Cabinet was replaced by an Operations Council chaired by the President. Other members of the Operations Council were the
vice president for academic affairs and student services, the vice president for administrative services/treasurer, the president of the faculty senate, the president of the staff council, and the president of the student senate (ex officio). All decisions affecting the operations of the College, excluding confidential personnel policy administration and problem solving, were processed through this Council. Meetings were held once a week, and summary notes of the meetings were published in the College newsletter.

Self-study recommendations for the leadership of Middle States Community College were that (a) the Board of Trustees diversify its members to reflect the ethnic and cultural makeup of the county, (b) a system be developed and implemented to ensure that all employees were cognizant of College policies and procedures, (c) the College catalog should be more comprehensive and more readily available to all incoming students, and (d) an orientation program for students should be developed and implemented (Self-Study Report, 1993, pp. 32-33).

The improvement of recruitment and retention of quality part-time and full-time and minority faculty was recommended
by the self-study team. Also of concern to the team was the ratio of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty (1:1); a ratio of three full-time faculty to two adjunct faculty was recommended (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 44). In addition, the team recommended that the College endeavor to increase the pool of qualified, available adjunct faculty and to ensure diversity in gender, ethnicity, and job classification on screening committees (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 47).

Technology also appeared as a major area of concern for the self-study team. The team recommended (a) that the old mainframe computer be replaced with up-to-date technology, (b) that personal computers on campus be networked, (c) that more powerful personal computers be purchased, (d) that an electronic mail system be implemented as personal computers were purchased and networked, (e) that out-dated studio-production equipment be replaced, (f) that new multimedia technology for campus-wide use be purchased, and (g) that service contracts be purchased for new multimedia equipment (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 68).

Library and individualized learning support center equipment was also found insufficient. The self-study team
recommended that methods be identified to consolidate and expand computer laboratories, and that this consolidation and expansion be addressed in scheduled renovations. Further recommendations included computerization of library catalogs and services and an increased commitment for full funding to ensure library collection maintenance and growth. Additional staffing was also recommended for both the library and individualized learning support center (Self-Study Report, pp. 70-71).

The self-study team also found that scientific, nursing, laboratory, and technical equipment needed to be repaired or replaced. Child care center facilities and hours of operation needed expansion, and additional staffing was necessary to meet the needs of more students (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 74).

Additional staffing, up-to-date computer technologies, funding for staff development, and increased and more efficient work space were also recommended by the self-study team for admissions, counseling and academic advising, financial aid, and the development offices. Further recommendations included the development and implementation of a student assessment and course placement program and a
process for graduate follow-up (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 80). It was also recommended that counseling and academic advising continue efforts to improve communication of articulation agreements and MSCC catalog changes to faculty and other institutions. Additionally, the self-study team recommended that counseling and academic advising obtain and maintain awareness and knowledge of community services and resources.

Renovation of educational facilities; funding for additional staffing; up-dated technology, more laboratories and computerization; more adequate and accurate student assessment—including pretesting and posttesting; and funding for staff development were recommended by the self-study team for allied health and nursing, arts and humanities, and the business divisions. In addition, it was recommended that faculty in the business division be given more authority and responsibility to pioneer new classes. Recommendations for the engineering technologies division included conducting graduate follow-up to assess student achievement resulting from student experiences at MSCC as well as employer surveys to determine satisfaction with graduate job performance. The team also recommended that
marketing plans be developed to focus on opportunities offered by the engineering division for various constituencies of the College (Self-Study Report, 1993, pp. 123-138).

Self-study team recommendations for the division of developmental education included (in addition to increased funding and staffing) meetings and cooperative efforts with other academic divisions to enhance student articulation to credit courses (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 134).

For programs designed to offer services and activities to students, the recommendations of the self-study team were for additional funding (a) to upgrade facilities and expand services, (b) to increase advertising, and (c) to provide additional staffing and training for new and existing employees. In addition, the self-study team recommended upgrading computerization and data collection to measure the long-range impact and effectiveness of programs and activities (Self-Study Report, 1993, pp. 149-158).

A section of the self-study report was devoted to planning for institutional change. The recommendations in this section of the report were factors that affected institutional climate (Self-Study Report, 1993, pp. 169-
The self-study team recommended that the college (a) continue its design and implementation of strategies establishing shared governance, (b) develop a process to communicate information and positive results of shared governance, (c) review salary and fringe benefit packages, (d) establish cross-functional teams to solve problems, (e) encourage decision making at the level affecting employees, and (f) enhance opportunities and funding for professional growth and development. In addition, recommendations were made for the development and implementation of strategies to meet the unique needs of the nontraditional student as well as the development of a continuous improvement process to review processes and procedures from a consumer standpoint (Self-Study Report, 1993, pp. 217-225. The self-study team also recommended that marketing continue to remind the community of the importance of MSCC's role in providing education and retraining for the workforce (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 217). Additionally, the team recommended that comprehensive marketing approaches should be used to heighten community awareness of the College and to continue to foster a positive relationship with the community.
Further recommendations by the self-study team for continuous improvement and institutional change were (a) the creation of evaluation mechanisms for noninstructional programs similar to those for instructional programs, (b) the development and implementation of a college-wide representative body to review and recommend changes in decision making affecting resource allocation, (c) the election of representatives to the institutional planning council and elimination of appointed representation, (d) the communication to all employees of the implementation of recommendations made by the institutional planning council, (e) the re-prioritization of strategic initiatives to highlight instruction, and (f) the creation of a system to identify and coordinate efforts and to minimize duplication (Self-Study Report, pp. 230-231).

Recommendations of the self-study team relating to the mission of MSCC were that employees must be provided periodic opportunities to review and discuss the mission and purpose of the College. Further, the self-study team recommended that the College develop appropriate measures for qualitative statements such as "enhance and enrich the
quality of life" of the county residents (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 21).

These concerns and recommendations indicated the perceptions of the self-study team of the issues in which change was needed for the College to continue to effectively provide educational and community services.

Reaffirmation Team Report Summary

The reaffirmation team reported that Middle States Community College "has outstanding leadership and committed, dedicated staff. Few institutions have such tremendous energy at all levels. . . . It holds the promise of being an exemplary institution for the rest of this century and the next" (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 1).

The team also reported that the College "is at the heart of the community it seeks to serve in countless ways" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1994, p. 1). Additionally, the reaffirmation team indicated that the College family had taken seriously the name of "community" because of the things they had accomplished. The College "has become . . . the heartbeat of community that begins at the college and resonates into the corners of the county which the college
serves and to the world beyond those borders" (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 1).

The team acknowledged that the College had not waited for the people of the community to come onto its campus, but that it had actually taken the "College to the people" (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 1) and, in doing so, "brought the people to the College" (Reaffirmation Team Report summary, 1994, p. 1).

The reaffirmation team acknowledged that the President had reorganized and re-energized the College and had encouraged and sought methods to give voice to all constituent groups (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 2). The team also indicated that employees were qualified, committed, and dedicated to doing their best and to making the College the best. The team cited the significant changes in hiring faculty and the elimination of the quota system. This enabled faculty promotion based upon merit and also promoted more equitable salary increases. However, the team recommended that the salary and fringe benefit negotiations be delegated to administrators and/or other professionals instead of the Board of Trustees.
The team also recommended that the College develop a process to eliminate or modify programs and/or services to promote growth.

What the College must do is design and implement a process for growing by substitution, rather than accretion determining what to let go and what to add to be faithful to the heart of the educational mission of a premier learning organization in this time and place (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 4).

Additionally, the team recommended that a comprehensive computing plan be developed addressing issues resulting from purchasing a new computing system. Also, computer systems, computer training, and staffing must be examined in the strategic planning process. The team recommended that the College consider additional grant writing support to identify sources of additional funding to meet the demands of an expanding campus.

The reaffirmation team report stated that the College has demonstrated tremendous strength as an organization. The leadership . . . of the President and the Board who selected him have forged a unique relationship with so many different constituents in the
county... the college clearly has identified the challenges of the present and of the future (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 5).

The report also indicated that "a real sense of community and camaraderie in the interactions of the administrators with each other and with the employees" (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 2) was evident at the College. The climate survey conducted during a change of administration and reduction in force indicated to the team that the College was "open and listened to and learned from everyone in the institution" (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 4).

The team perceived the College had clear, publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and were impressed with the methods MSCC used to accomplish its purpose. Student outreach efforts and community collaborative efforts were acknowledged by the team as a reflection of the commitment of the College to carry out its mission.

The reaffirmation team recommended that the College combine quantifiable data with qualitative measures in developing and implementing a comprehensive student academic
achievement assessment plan. This plan should be developed to measure what students had learned and how the College could use this knowledge to make improvements in the teaching and learning cycle.

In addition to the recommendations, the accrediting agency team made several suggestions. These were that the College continue to improve the evaluation of programs and the transfer and articulation plans. Additionally, the team suggested that the College (a) maintain the Operations Council in its present form, (b) utilize the Operations Council to receive recommendations of committees, (c) review the impact of the reduction in force to determine whether affected areas had the ability to effectively perform their assigned duties, (d) assess adjunct to full-time faculty ratio and develop mechanisms to determine the best alternatives for quality education, (e) develop an effective faculty evaluation utilizing student evaluations, peer observation, and supervisor review, (f) study development of a plan for updating computing software and hardware, and (g) promote computerization of library resources (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, pp. 5-6).
The final recommendation of the accrediting agency team was that MSCC be reaccredited.

**Interviews with Selected College Employees**

Twenty-seven employees of Middle States Community College were selected to interview. These interviewees were selected from the College catalog based upon the employee function and the date the employee was hired at the College. Interviewees were selected from all employee groups of the College to obtain the perceptions of a cross-section of the employees.

Letters were mailed requesting an appointment for a telephone interview (Appendix B). Four letters were returned with an indication that the individuals did not wish to be interviewed, and one person was no longer employed at Middle States Community College. Of the 22 remaining selected employees, 12 did not respond to the request for an interview or to subsequent follow-up telephone and e-mail messages. Interviews were conducted with 10 employees. These individuals represented various positions and levels of employees. There were three associate professors, one professor, three administrative
support staff, one technical support staff, and the President of the College.

Of the 10 individuals interviewed, eight agreed with the priorities for change (Table 1) identified by the survey results; and two (the President and one Administrative Staff) viewed the results as another piece of data to help guide decision making and change initiatives. The level of agreement with the results of the survey ranged from strongly agree to agree. Six believed that the climate survey portrayed the College climate accurately, one (Support Staff) believed that the climate was portrayed higher than it was, and two (both Associate Professors) indicated that the portrayal of the climate was lower than the climate actually was.

The frequency of administration of the climate surveys was the next question to which interviewees responded. Nine of the 10 interviewees stated that climate surveys should not be conducted any more frequently than they were (MSCC administered a climate survey every two years). These nine people also believed that the surveys were valuable in identifying issues in which change was needed. One person
(a Professor) did not know how frequently climate surveys should be administered.

Interview respondents identified several areas of needed change that were also shown by both the climate survey results and the reaffirmation team report. These areas of needed change were (a) the improvement of communication, both the level and frequency, (b) the input/involvement in decision making, (c) the improvement of complicated processes, (d) the need for current technology, (e) the need for student assessment, (f) the inability of forums to implement decisions, (g) the need for employee evaluations, and (h) the improvement of job security. Eight interviewees were not surprised at the priorities for change identified by the survey. One respondent (President), however, was surprised by the identification of the perceived lack of input into the decision making process indicated by support staff responses to the survey. One interviewee (Professor) was surprised that input into decision making was perceived to be low.

When questioned about whether the results of the survey met their expectations, seven stated that the indication of the overall college climate was about what they expected.
Two (Associate Professors) really were not sure what expectations they had about what the results would be, and one (Professional and Support Staff) was not employed at the time the survey was conducted.

All interviewees perceived that survey results were used in various planning and change efforts. A long range plan for staff development was developed and implemented. Listings of staff development opportunities were developed and published in a timely manner.

Additionally, a new member was appointed to the Operations Council as a result of the climate survey data. The President indicated that he would have thought that, because he "wandered around a lot and knew them (support staff) personally, he would have sensed the depth of their feelings" (Interview, 1996) about a lack of input into the decision making process. As a result of the climate survey data, membership of the Operations Council was expanded to include the President of the Support Staff Senate. Supervisors and team leaders were trained in the use of Blake & Mouton's managerial grid to ensure issues "did not disappear into a black hole" (One Professional and Support Staff and Two Associate Professors).
Communications were improved using a weekly newsletter that published issues discussed and decisions made by the Operations Council. Bulletins for students with current and detailed course information were also developed and published, and a newsletter was created and mailed to all county taxpayers.

Additionally, a salary and benefits committee was developed to review and recommend changes in salary scales for staff and faculty. This committee also was to review and recommend changes in processes to enhance the recruitment and retention of a high-quality faculty.

Some of the factors interviewees stated that contributed to the perception of ownership in the mission of MSCC were the (a) shift in the level of respect the community had for the College; (b) the hands-on President, the "President has a personal touch" (two Associate Professors, one Professional and Support Staff, and one Professor); (c) the respect administration (especially the President) had for individual employees, "the President goes to individual classes--even the nursing classes at the hospital" (Associate Professor); (d) the people believed in the leaders of the college; (e) participative governance;
(f) the administration actually tried "to connect with the faculty" (Professor); and (g) the university partnership initiated by the President.

Although there were areas of change identified by interviewees, overall, there was a prevailing positive attitude about the College. Such attitudes were evidenced by interviewee statements such as (a) "when you see success stories and the difference this College makes in the community and in students lives, you see an ownership in the mission" (Professional and Technical Support Staff), (b) this President has "made more of a push for involvement in the community" (Professor), and (c) the "President cares about each individual and what he or she does" (Associate Professor), (d) "we don't just go to the people (community) when we need money, we are constantly . . . informing them of opportunities we offer" (Administrative Staff), and (e) the President "is dedicated to the campus and community. . because of his dedication, we get involved and it becomes ours, you are not willing to sit on the outside and watch" (Support Staff).

Table 2 summarizes the priorities for change identified by results from each of the four data sources for Middle
States Community College. Although there were various priorities for change identified by each source of data, there were common priorities which appeared in each set of data. These commonalities are shown in Table 2.
### TABLE 2.

**MIDDLE STATES COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMON PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of involvement in decisions affecting employee</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation exists across departments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee is assisted by administration in improving work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards match quality of work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees satisfied with job security</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of satisfaction in energy needed to complete work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of information supports work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information received supports work</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration inspires sense of purpose</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration uses/supports innovative ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration supports professional development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration influences professional growth and development</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration willingly shares information</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Sources of data were (A) the PACE Climate Survey, (B) the Self-Study Team Report, (C) the Reaffirmation Team Report, and (D) the Employee Interviews.
Summary of Data from Midwestern Technical College

Located in the suburbs of a small Midwestern city 100 miles from a major metropolitan area, Midwestern Technical College was founded in 1967. For the academic year of 1994-95, the College had an enrollment of 14,782 full-time and part-time students and 900 staff and faculty.

Four sources of data also were reviewed for Midwestern Technical College (MTC). These were the PACE Climate Survey, the self-study team report, the accrediting agency report, and employee interview data. The summarization of the issues perceived as needing change or improvement as identified by each of the data sources follows.

PACE Climate Survey

The data for the PACE climate survey were collected at Midwestern Technical College (MTC) in October, 1994 as the beginning of the self-study process for reaccreditation. The survey was completed by 489 (54 %) full-time and part-time employees.

The instrument contained 57 items or statements identifying employee perceptions; i.e., the extent my manager supports my work. The PACE survey instrument was
"adapted in consultation with the administration" (PACE Survey, 1994, p. 3) of the College. Although some flexibility is allowed in the number of items for each climate factor (colleges may add any item or items they perceive as important), the climate factors remain constant. Maintaining the same climate factors allows comparisons to other colleges using this survey. Although some means for MTC in some climate items and/or factor categories were above the means of other colleges surveyed, the gap or distance from the mean and the 4.50 "ideal" (for the PACE Climate Survey) is the amount of improvement needed in these areas. The top priorities for change were those with means below 3.50.

There were six employee groups at Midwestern Technical College. These employee groups were full-time management, part-time management, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, full-time support staff, and part-time support staff.

**Formal Influence.** Three employee groups ranked highest (or the item least needing improvement) the extent they were given opportunities to be creative in their work. These groups and their means were: (a) full-time management (M =
4.20), (b) full-time faculty (M = 4.14), and (c) part-time faculty (M = 4.07). Both the full-time support staff and part-time support staff groups rated as highest the extent their manager expressed confidence in their work (M = 4.09, M = 4.38, respectively). The extent quality guidance was given regarding work was ranked highest by the part-time management employee group (M = 4.17).

In the formal influence climate factor, all six employee groups rated lowest (or the top priority for change) their ability to influence the direction of the college. The means for each group were: (a) full-time management (M = 3.44), (b) part-time management (M = 3.33), (c) full-time faculty (M = 3.00), (d) part-time faculty (M = 3.21), (e) full-time support staff (M = 3.00), and (f) part-time support staff (M = 3.26).

Organizational Structure. The highest ranking item for three employee groups was the extent the variety of work was appropriate. These three employee groups and their means were (a) full-time management (M = 4.06), (b) full-time faculty (M = 3.89), and (c) full-time support staff (M = 3.97). Part-time faculty and part-time support staff rated
as highest the extent they were able to organize the work day (M = 4.14, M = 4.12, respectively). Part-time management ranked highest the extent the amount of work done was appropriate (M = 4.17).

In the organizational structure climate factor, four employee groups ranked lowest (the top priority for change) the extent decisions were made at the appropriate level. These groups and their means were (a) full-time management (M = 3.00), (b) full-time faculty (M = 2.93), (c) full-time support staff (M = 2.78), and (d) part-time support staff (M = 3.45). Both the part-time management and part-time faculty employee groups identified the extent quality feedback was received as their top priority for change (M = 3.17).

Communication. Three employee groups rated highest (or the lowest priority for change) the extent the information they generated was shared with others. These groups and their scores were (a) full-time management (M = 3.94), (b) full-time support staff, (M = 3.62), and (c) part-time support staff, (M = 3.88). Full-time and part-time faculty rated as highest the extent an ethnically and culturally
diverse environment was valued ($M = 3.57, M = 3.88$, respectively). The extent information received was useful in their work was rated as highest by the part-time management group ($M = 4.50$).

All six employee groups agreed that the top priority for change (the lowest ranking item) was the extent information was shared so that decision makers had access to accurate and current information. The individual employee groups and their means were (a) full-time management ($M = 3.08$), (b) part-time management ($M = 2.33$), (c) full-time faculty ($M = 2.89$), (d) part-time faculty ($M = 3.26$), (e) full-time support staff ($M = 2.82$), and (f) part-time support staff ($M = 3.19$).

**Collaboration.** The highest ranked item (or the one needing the least improvement for MTC) in the collaboration climate factor for the full-time management, part-time management, and full-time faculty employee groups was the extent opportunities existed to work jointly with others ($M = 4.30, M = 4.17, M = 3.89$, respectively). Part-time faculty and part-time support staff rated highest the extent a spirit of cooperation existed within their work team ($M =$
The highest rated item for the full-time support staff employee group was the extent opportunities existed for ideas to be exchanged within work teams (M = 3.70).

Five of the six employee groups identified as the top priority (the lowest ranked item) for change in the collaboration climate factor the extent college-wide, cross functional teams used problem-solving techniques. These groups and their means were (a) full-time management (M = 3.42), (b) part-time management (M = 3.00) (c) full-time faculty (M = 3.11), (d) part-time faculty (M = 3.33), and (e) part-time support staff (M = 3.14). Full-time support staff identified as a top priority for change the extent a spirit of cooperation existed at the college (M = 3.09).

Work Design. The highest ranked item (or the least in need of change) for full-time management and part-time faculty was the extent employees were responsible for meaningful work (M = 4.57, M = 4.51, respectively). Two items, the extent accuracy was expected in the job and the extent employees were comfortable working at the college, tied for the highest ranking for the part-time management
employment group (M = 4.50 for both items). Full-time support staff identified the extent accuracy was expected in the job as the highest ranking item (M = 4.33). Part-time support staff rated as highest the extent they were comfortable working at the college (M = 4.28).

For the work design climate factor, three employee groups rated as lowest (or the top priority for change) the extent opportunities existed for advancement. These groups and their means were (a) full-time management (M = 3.17), (b) part-time management (M = 2.83), and (c) part-time support staff (M = 3.42). The extent work was guided by clearly defined administrative processes was ranked lowest by full-time faculty and by full-time support staff (M = 3.02, M = 3.16, respectively). Part-time faculty rated as lowest the extent managers helped them improve their work (M = 3.49).

**Student Focus.** Full-time management, full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and full-time support staff ranked highest (or the item least needing improvement) the extent the College prepared students for a career (M = 4.19, M = 4.18, M = 4.33, M = 3.93, respectively). Part-time
management and part-time support staff both rated highest the extent students received a quality education at the College \((M = 4.33, M = 4.29, \text{ respectively})\).

Two items tied for lowest priority for change in this climate factor for the part-time management group \((M = 3.33)\). These were the extent students were assisted in their personal development and the extent ethnic and cultural diversity were important issues in the curriculum. Full-time management also identified the extent ethnic and cultural diversity were important as their lowest item \((M = 3.10)\). Full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and full-time support staff ranked as their top priority for change--or the item with the lowest mean--the extent administrative personnel met the educational needs of students \((M = 3.22, = 3.64, \text{ and } M = 3.35, \text{ in order})\). Part-time support staff ranked as their lowest item the extent students were assisted with their personal development \((M = 3.71)\).

The six individual employee groups combined identified 12 items common to all groups as areas in need of improvement. Of these 12, five items (areas in which change was needed) appeared in the top 10 items on the lists of all six individual employee groups. These items were (a) the
extent decisions were made at the appropriate level, (b) the extent information was shared so that decision makers had access to accurate and current information, (c) the extent opportunities for advancement existed, (d) the extent college-wide cross functional teams utilized problem-solving techniques, and (e) the extent employees could appropriately influence the direction of the college. The college-wide priorities for change and their ratings are shown in Table 3.

Two of the college-wide priorities for change fall into the formal influence factor of college climate. These priorities were the extent of the ability of the employee to influence the direction of the college and the extent the college was successful in influencing positive attitudes. The college-wide average ranking for all 10 items affecting the formal influence factor of college climate was 3.68. Although this college-wide mean was higher than the average ranking for all institutions completing this survey (3.35), there was needed improvement on these items (represented by the gap or distance from the ideal 4.5 mean for this survey).
Three priorities for change listed in Table 3 affected the communication factor of college climate. These were (a) the extent information was shared so that decision makers have accurate and current information, (b) the extent adequate information was received, and (c) the extent information was shared in a timely manner. The college-wide average for all employee groups for all items affecting communication was 3.42. The average rating for all institutions completing this survey was 3.19.

The priorities for change in collaboration for MTC shown in Table 3 were the extent college-wide, cross functional teams used problem-solving techniques, and the extent a spirit of cooperation existed. The college-wide average of all eight items affecting collaboration for all employees was 3.63, and the average rating for all institutions completing this survey was 3.20.

The priorities for change affecting the organizational structure factor of college climate for MTC were (a) the extent decisions were made at the appropriate level, (b) the extent quality feedback was received, and (c) the extent adequate feedback was received. The average rating for the organizational structure factor for all employee groups was
### TABLE 3.

**MIDWESTERN TECHNICAL COLLEGE PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was shared so that decision</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makers have accurate/current information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made at appropriate level</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of ability to influence direction of the College</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared in timely manner</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide, cross functional teams</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilize problem-solving techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities exist for advancement</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality feedback is received</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate information is received</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient feedback is received</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college influences positive attitudes</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A spirit of cooperation exists</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average for all institutions completing the survey was 3.47.
The college-wide mean for all climate factors for all employee groups was 3.63. The average of all colleges completing this survey was 3.31. Although Midwestern Technical College's college-wide climate mean was above the national average, the average scores on all factors was below the PACE "ideal" mean (4.50). This "ideal" 4.50 score represents a System 4 or participatory system.

No organization has been found to have achieved the ideal System 4 environment, except in some aspects of certain categories, and with some categories of employees. Thus, the System 4 environment remains a climate to be sought through planning and participation (PACE Climate Survey Report, 1994, p. iii).

Self-Study Recommendations

The self-study process at Midwestern Technical College was completed in October, 1995. Governance at MTC has been evolving from the traditional model of management since 1985 when administration adopted the quality model that emphasized team-based management. MTC was one of the first colleges to "adopt and apply a quality model in all aspects of its operation" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 4).
Management positions were evaluated and realigned which resulted in a reduction in the number of jobs classified as management. This realignment more clearly defined duties and responsibilities. The College had also "established approximately 60 academic teams...the ultimate goal is for each work unit or instructional department to become a self-managed team through the gradual transitional movement from traditional management to self management" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 33).

Commitment to integrate total quality management principles into the College environment led to many challenges at MTC. The self-study team indicated that accountability structures and parameters to guide self-managed teams needed to be developed and implemented. Staff development programs and training in continuous process improvements were also recommended to assist the College in overcoming the challenges faced by the move to empowerment of all employees and to a participatory governance structure (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 41).

The quality or continuous improvement movement also impacted the human resources division at MTC. Professional development opportunities were upgraded significantly with
the inception of the quality movement. The self-study team recognized that, although there had been a low turnover of employees, the College must develop and implement a retirement and replacement plan. The College must also become more aggressive in recruiting a diverse population. The team also recommended that a faculty evaluation process be developed and implemented (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 54).

Although MTC had enjoyed strong fiscal viability, the self-study team recommended that the planning and budgeting process be improved by better communication of user-friendly and integrated systems of financial, student, staffing, and demographic data. Processes should also be developed and implemented which simplify budgeting and operational planning processes and forms as well as to provide better planning and sharing of financial information to staff. Additionally, the self-study team recommended that staff training programs on the use of financial data and accountability processes be developed and implemented. (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 67-68).

The College also had benefited from a strong local economy that enabled it to adequately meet facility and
equipment needs; however, the self-study team identified two areas in which improvements were needed. The team recommended that the College (a) continue to improve signage to more effectively provide services to customers, and (b) refine inventory data management and space utilization systems. (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 81).

MTC employed a systematic educational program and support services audit process as well as a comprehensive needs assessment process. Internships and other work-based learning activities as well as articulation agreements proved valuable in ensuring that programs and services met the needs of the students and the community. However, the self-study team recommended the development and implementation of a process to improve the use of employment and occupational data to modify programs and services as well as to ensure the continuous upgrading of the knowledge and skills of the staff. The team also recommended that the College allocate additional resources to upgrade and increase technology in courses and to develop alternative instructional delivery systems. (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 103).
For many years, MTC had provided contracted educational and training services to community employers. MTC and community employers utilized an economic development contract which detailed the type of work-force education or training needed by the employer. The College could provide training from an existing degree, diploma, or continuing education program or it could customize a course or courses to meet the unique needs of the client. Other contracted services were (a) customization of training materials, (b) assessments measuring aptitudes or skills for job entry or promotion, and (c) assessments measuring basic skills or motor skills specific to a particular industrial job (Self-Study Report, 1995, pp. 104-105). MTC was the first technical college in its state to expand contracted services; and in 1995, 70% of service contracts were delivered by full-time faculty. Although this work-force training had proved valuable to faculty in exposure to current technologies and business operations and processes, the team recommended that certain changes be made. These changes included (a) the marketing of services; (b) the coordination of client contracting activities; (c) current, available client contracting cost and expense data; (d)
client contracting evaluation; (e) current, available client data base; (f) the appointment of one contact person in each instructional division to coordinate the delivery of training; and (g) the development and implementation of a process to deliver timely contracted services (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 112).

The student services area at MTC was reorganized in 1992 to increase its effectiveness in meeting student and community needs. The self-study team stated that the greatest need for student services was to expand services, especially counseling services, to all regional centers (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 130). The team also recommended the development and implementation of methods to improve admissions and registration processes as well as to strengthen linkages with academic divisions thus ensuring consistent, accurate services to students. Additionally, the team stated that computer services also must be developed and implemented to track students and provide assessment information. Further, the team recommended that an evaluation process for all student services programs be developed and implemented (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 130).
Available financial resources was identified by the self-study team as the greatest need in the academic support services of instructional and computer laboratories, the library, College printing services, curriculum and instructional technology services, and the information processing center. Computer technology, staffing, additional and modified facilities, technical support, and an electronic tracking system for computer hardware and software were also areas identified by the team as needing improvement. Additionally, the team indicated that the College should increase efforts to provide accessibility to all academic support services for outreach locations (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 143).

Information services, physical plant, maintenance, mail, security, financial services, marketing, recruitment, public relations, human resources, and planning research and development comprise the institutional support services at MTC. Although the self-study team indicated that this division of the College generally had "a strong customer service orientation" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 156), there were several areas identified in which improvements were needed. These were (a) intradepartmental and
interdepartmental communications; (b) specific information regarding available services, contact person(s), procedures, and time lines; and (c) timely identification of target marketing areas and needs.

The self-study team also explored the quality of the environment at MTC. The College had used surveys to study the climate since 1987. The surveys used through 1990 had been developed for business settings. In 1994, the College elected to change the survey instrument to the PACE Climate Survey because it "was developed for an educational setting" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 184). In addition to the survey instrument, focus groups were used to gather feedback on the College climate from faculty, staff, and students. Although the overall results were positive, the self-study team identified several areas of concern. Communication has been a problem at the College, and students have consistently requested more accurate course scheduling, advisement, and policy and procedural communications. Another recommendation was the clarification of faculty, support, and administrative staff roles in the decision making process (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 195).
The self-study team also indicated that a broad-based, formal strategic planning process using data on internal and external needs, trends and changes must be developed and implemented. Additionally, the team stated that in-service training programs on employee roles and expectations in empowerment and shared governance to support strategic planning must be developed (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 200).

Reaffirmation Team Report

The reaffirmation team noted that the recent move by MTC to total quality management, the implementation of a strategic leadership team including the presidents of both employee unions, the new president, and a committed board of trustees had "revolutionized . . . governance. . . The changes have all been for the good" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 6).

Although agreeing with the self-study team that the staff and faculty were qualified and involved, the reaffirmation team recommended that MTC adopt "the bachelor's degree as the minimum employment credential for new occupational faculty to complement the College's
practice of requiring the master's degree as the minimum
credential for new general education faculty" (Reaffirmation
Team Report, 1995, p. 8).

The reaffirmation team also recommended that the College
provide assistance for professional development to those
desiring improvement of academic credentials. In addition,
the team recommended that human resources update practices
in internal transfer and displacement of faculty to reflect
the College's minimum hiring standards as well as consider
processes to effectively manage expected staff turnover.
The lack of an evaluation process for faculty was also noted
by the team as a concern "in a system which values
continuous improvement, the lack of faculty performance
appraisals is incongruent" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995,
p. 9).

The reaffirmation team expressed a concern regarding the
two-year technical diploma programs. It suggested that,
since the programs were the same length as the two-year
associate degree programs, the general education component
should be increased. Additionally, the team suggested that
a co-op coordinator could reduce the co-op placement
concerns caused by increasing student enrollment
(Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 20).

The general education component of curriculum programs
also caused concern among the members of the reaffirmation
team. Their concerns were that (a) the state technical
college system had classified math and science as program
support rather than general education as defined by the
accrediting agency, (b) many curriculum developers failed to
distinguish between support (related) courses and general
education courses, and (c) the prevailing faculty philosophy
regarding the lack of the importance of general education
courses or applied program courses which often motivated
learning more effectively was not consistent with the
agency's statement on general education (Reaffirmation Team
Report, 1995, p. 25). Additionally, the team indicated that
MTC mixed general education and support or related courses
that diminished the purpose, content, and importance of
each. Three technical programs were identified that did not
fulfill the general education requirements of the
accrediting agency. There were also associate degree
programs for which the team recommended a review to
distinguish between general education and support courses as
well as the appropriate distribution of credit hours and general education courses (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 25). Finally, the accrediting agency team recommended that the college fulfill accrediting agency requirements for general education definition and content. Also recommended was that the College develop and implement a student academic assessment and achievement model which ensured curricular improvement if or when such improvement was necessary.

The student services area received one suggestion from the reaffirmation team. This was that a publication listing days and times of class offerings would be helpful to marketing, students, and the general public. Schedules were not published because students enrolled in specific programs had predetermined schedules for both program or major and general education classes. This lack of class schedules was detrimental to students who needed to adapt their schedules to "fit into their own work or family plan" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 26).

Academic support services needs identified by the reaffirmation team were that MTC should (a) seek student input into laboratory equipment access and upgrading, (b)
routinely update laboratories, (c) redesign the writing center to provide privacy, (d) increase library holdings, and (e) develop and implement an ongoing process for faculty input into acquisition of library holdings (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 30-31).

The reaffirmation team found that "shared understanding of the college's mission and dedication to serving the college's most important customers--both students and regional businesses--apparently motivate college administrators, faculty and staff efforts to communicate effectively with each other" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 34).

The team encouraged MTC to develop a published, broad-based, comprehensive, long-range strategic plan.

The final recommendation of the reaffirmation team was that the College be reaccredited.

**Interviews with Selected College Employees**

Letters requesting an appointment for a telephone interview were mailed to 42 employees of MTC. Eight returned the survey indicating that they would not be interested in interviewing, and 24 did not respond although
follow-up to the letter was conducted by telephone and email. Ten employees scheduled interviews and were interviewed.

Those interviewed represented various levels of positions in the College. There were three instructors (one of whom was president of the faculty union), two support staff, two vice presidents, one dean, one associate dean, and the President of the College.

All 10 of the interviewees agreed that the priorities for change (Table 2) identified by survey responses were accurate. The range of agreement with the survey results was from "fairly accurate" (President, July, 1996) to "very, very accurate" (Support Staff, July, 1996). Five respondents indicated that the portrayal of College climate was fairly accurate (President, three Faculty, two Vice Presidents, and one Dean). One interviewee (Support Staff) stated that there was some fear that a supervisor might see the results and would know who had responded; therefore, the survey items were marked with that in mind. Another (Support Staff) indicated that some department heads communicated to the members that the department was being graded, and "we want to get an 'A'" (Support Staff, 1996).
The rest of the respondents stated that the results were either fairly or quite accurate; however, one interviewee indicated that "it is always getting the results and doing something with it that is a problem" (Instructor, 1996).

Six of the interviewees indicated that there were no surprises in the survey results. One respondent stated his surprise at the extent communications appeared as an area of concern because "communication is a two-way street; faculty is more involved now. . . an extensive bunch of information is shared at monthly meetings" (Instructor, 1996). Two interviewees (President and Instructor) indicated that survey results actually confirmed knowledge they had obtained from other sources, that it validated what they already knew. Further, the survey results actually allowed one respondent to "as a dean, get at the relationship I have with people in my department. . . I can pinpoint areas in which I need to improve" (Dean, 1996). One interviewee stated that decision makers were "surprised with the extent of concern about the lack of cross-functional teams and problem solving techniques" (Associate Dean, 1996).

When questioned about the issues that surfaced in both the PACE climate survey results and the accrediting agency
team report, several common concerns were identified. These were the lack of (a) up-to-date communications and timely, accurate information needed to make decisions; (b) student access to course information; (c) a faculty performance evaluation process; (d) a long-range institutional plan; (e) the use of intra-departmental and inter-departmental teams in decision making; and (f) training in and use of problem solving techniques.

Nine of the 10 interviewees indicated that survey results were used in college-wide planning. The information was used at a retreat of the strategic leadership team (the President of the College, the Vice Presidents, the Executive President of the Faculty Union, and Executive President of the Support Staff Union) and approximately 30-32 other employees. Representatives of all employee groups as well as all mid-level managers were involved in this retreat. Also because of survey results, mid-level management was more involved in decision making processes (Dean). Some interviewees (Vice President, Associate Dean, Instructor) indicated that change based upon survey results seemed to occur primarily on a departmental or divisional level rather than college-wide. One interviewee (Associate Dean)
indicated that the division, in an effort to improve communications within the division, published its own monthly newsletter. "This highlights the departments within the division and lets everyone in each department know what is going on within and without the department" (Associate Dean, September, 1996).

In addition, the members of this division were asked to suggest professional development activities that would promote communications. Another indication that change efforts may occur primarily at the divisional or departmental level is that one respondent (Instructor) stated that "superficially. . . results have been used in planning; but specific things. . .utilization of the results is unknown. . . There is no good follow-up to determine results of any change efforts (Instructor, August, 1996).

Of the 10 interviewees, nine indicated that the frequency of surveys (every three years) at MTC was about right. One (Instructor) indicated that every year would be better; however, others indicated that too frequent administration of a climate survey would not allow enough time to use data in planning. Two respondents (Instructor and Vice President) indicated that, as important as it is to
conduct surveys, it is equally as important to follow-up to ensure that changes occur as a result of survey data. "Climate survey information and how it is to be incorporated into college planning and daily activities should . . . be articulated with the board and faculty (Vice President, September, 1996).

When questioned about the factors interviewees perceived contributed to the level of ownership employees had in the mission of MTC, nine of the 10 cited positive factors. One respondent (Instructor), however, indicated that, although the President indicated his support for quality initiatives and empowerment, teams were unclear about their responsibilities and level of authority. This respondent also indicated that the President appeared to listen to vice presidents who have no mid-level managers. Mid-level managers, due to downsizing initiated by the previous president, felt overburdened, that they had increased responsibilities and no corresponding authority. There were also indications that there were those (Instructor, Support Staff) who perceived that no significant change would occur until the next self study process begins; "ten years is a long time" (Instructor, 1996).
Those who responded positively to perceived ownership in the mission identified certain factors contributing to that ownership. These were (a) teams were developed to address survey issues; (b) opportunities for involvement existed, employees could "be as involved as they want to be" (Vice President, July, 1996; (c) the philosophy had changed toward more collaborative decision making; (d) people believed they have "a stake in the final solution," (Vice President, September, 1996) (e) shared governance (Vice President), (f) "multitudes of opportunities for staff to be as involved as they want to be and really 'own' . . . the mission" (Vice President, July, 1996), and (g) people have input into the process (Faculty). Much credit was attributed to the new President for the perception of ownership in the mission. "Leadership can make or break the continuous improvement effort" (Associate Dean, September, 1996). The President "has been here three years, and we are really coming together as a team" (Associate Dean, September, 1996). One interviewee (President) stated that employees of the College were "living our core values. . . . Core values serve as drivers for why we do certain things, a "touch to the heart," the reason we take certain initiatives (President,
July, 1996). Another respondent (Dean) indicated that the President consistently demonstrated his commitment for participatory governance. He "sets the tone for the involvement of all people at all levels of the organization. Our President promotes this involvement. . ." (Dean, September, 1996).

Although the four sources of data identified various issues, there were common priorities for change shown by all data sources for MTC. These common priorities for change and the data sources are listed in Table 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared so decision makers have accurate and current information</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made at proper level</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of ability of employee to influence direction of the College</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared in timely manner</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide, cross-functional teams utilize problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities exist for advancement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality feedback is received</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate information received</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient feedback received</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College influences positive attitude</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit of cooperation exists</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sources of data are (A) the PACE Climate Survey, (B) the Self-Study Team Report, (C) the Reaffirmation Team Report, and (D) the Employee Interview.
Summary of Data from Northeastern Community College

Northeastern Community College, located in a large northeastern city, enrolled its first students in 1973, a class of 400 students. Throughout its brief history, the College had struggled for financial stability and facilities. Additionally, it had suffered "intense and constant internal and external disputes" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 16). At the time of the study, the College employed 175 people and had an enrollment of 2,687 full-time and part-time students. Four sources of data for Northeastern Community College were studied to identify priorities for change.

PACE Climate Survey

Of the 175 employees of Northeastern Community College (NCC), 133 (76%) completed the PACE climate survey in April of 1994 as the initial phase of the self-study process for reaffirmation. There were eight employee groups at NCC; these groups were (a) full-time administrators, (b) part-time administrators, (c) full-time instructors, (d) part-time instructors, (e) full-time noninstructional professionals, (f) part-time noninstructional professionals,
(g) full-time classified employees, and (h) part-time classified employees.

Formal Influence. Full-time classified employees ranked as highest (or the priority needing the least change) the extent the manager expressed confidence in their work ($M = 4.00$). Part-time non-instructional professionals rated as highest the extent the college was successful in influencing positive attitudes about diverse populations in the college community ($M = 3.85$). Both the full-time noninstructional professional employee group and the part-time instructional employee group had two items that tied for highest ranking. These items were the extent the manager expressed confidence in employees' work and the extent creative opportunities existed in the work groups ($M = 3.93$, $M = 5.00$, respectively). Part-time classified employees and full-time instructional employees ranked highest the extent opportunities existed for creativity in their work ($M = 4.22$, $M = 3.93$, respectively). Part-time administrators rated highest the extent their manager encouraged professional development ($M = 4.50$).
The lowest ranking item or the top priority for change at the College in formal influence for both full-time classified employees and full-time noninstructional professionals was their ability to influence the direction of the college (M = 3.10, M = 3.06, respectively). Both the full-time instructional and part-time noninstructional professional employee groups ranked lowest the extent the institution encouraged professional development (M = 2.63, M = 3.15, respectively). The extent the college was successful in influencing positive attitudes about diverse populations in the college community was rated lowest by full-time administrators (M = 3.23). Two items tied for lowest ranking for part-time administrators (M = 3.50). These items were (a) the extent employees received quality guidance in their work, and (b) the extent professional development was encouraged. The lowest rated item for part-time classified employees was the extent their ideas were seriously considered (M = 2.63), and part-time instructional employees had two items as their lowest ranking (M = 1.00). These were (a) the extent the institution encouraged professional development, and (b) the extent of employee ability to influence the direction of the college.
The college-wide mean for formal influence was 3.38. The national average was 3.35.

**Organizational Structure.** Four employee groups ranked highest (or the lowest priority for change) their ability to organize their own work day. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified ($M = 4.04$), (b) full-time instructional ($M = 4.13$), (c) part-time administrators ($M = 4.50$), and (d) full-time noninstructional professional staff ($M = 3.73$). The extent the variety of work was appropriate was rated highest by part-time classified full-time administrators, and part-time noninstructional professional staff ($M = 4.55$, $M = 3.83$, $M = 4.00$, respectively). The part-time instructional employee group identified two of the nine items as highest ($M = 4.00$). These were (a) the extent sufficient feedback was received, and (b) the extent policies and procedures were actually followed that promoted ethnic and cultural diversity.

The lowest ranking item (or the item in which the most change was needed) in organizational structure for five employee groups was the extent decisions were made at the level where the most adequate and accurate information was
available. These five groups and their means were (a) full-time classified \((M = 2.90)\), (b) full-time instructional \((M = 2.37)\), (c) full-time administrators \((M = 2.68)\), (d) full-time noninstructional professional staff \((M = 2.80)\), and (e) part-time noninstructional professional staff \((M = 3.00)\). Part-time classified employees ranked lowest the extent policies and procedures guided their work, and part-time administrative rated lowest the extent policies and procedures were actually followed which promoted ethnic and cultural diversity \((M = 3.00, M = 3.00\), respectively). Part-time instructional staff rated as lowest six of the nine items for the organizational structure climate factor. These six items were the extent (a) policies and procedures guided work, (b) the amount of work was appropriate, (c) the variety of work was appropriate, (d) of their freedom to organize their work day, (e) participation in college affairs was encouraged, and (f) decisions were made at level where most adequate and accurate information was available \((M = 1.00)\).

For organizational structure college-wide, the mean was 3.33. The national average was 3.47.
Communication. Five of the six employee groups ranked highest (the priority needing the least change) the extent ethnic and cultural diversity was valued by the College. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified employees ($M = 3.56$), (b) full-time instructors ($M = 3.57$), (c) part-time instructors ($M = 5.00$), (d) full-time administrators ($M = 3.94$), and (e) full-time noninstructional professionals ($M = 3.43$). The highest rated item for part-time classified employees and part-time noninstructional professionals was the extent they were satisfied with the amount of information received ($M = 3.88$, $M = 3.78$, respectively). Part-time administrative employees ranked as highest (the item least needing change) the extent useful information was received ($M = 4.00$).

Three employee groups--full-time instructional, part-time instructional, and part-time administrator--ranked as their lowest (or the top priority for change) the extent decision makers had access to accurate and current information ($M = 2.22$, $M = 1.00$, $M = 3.00$, respectively). Part-time classified employees and full-time noninstructional professionals ranked as lowest the extent the work group received adequate information about what was
happening in other departments ($M = 2.00$, $M = 2.38$, respectively). The extent unacceptable behaviors were identified and communicated ranked lowest for full-time classified, full-time administrator, and part-time non-instructional employees ($M = 2.45$, $M = 2.50$, $M = 3.00$, respectively).

The college-wide mean for communication was 2.94. The national average was 3.19.

**Collaboration.** Another factor affecting climate at NCC was collaboration. Five employee groups ranked as highest (the item least needing change) the extent a spirit of cooperation existed within their work area. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified ($M = 3.31$), (b) part-time instructional ($M = 4.00$), (c) part-time administrator ($M = 4.00$), (d) full-time noninstructional professional ($M = 2.40$), and (e) part-time noninstructional professional ($M = 3.78$). Both full-time instructional and full-time administrative staff ranked as highest the extent the work group coordinated efforts ($M = 3.52$, $M = 4.00$, respectively). The collaboration item ranked highest by
part-time classified staff was the extent the staff worked as a team (M = 3.77).

Four employee groups rated as lowest, or the top priority for change in collaboration, the extent the college used group problem-solving techniques. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified (M = 2.50), (b) part-time administrators (M = 3.00), (c) full-time noninstructional professionals (M = 2.70), and (d) part-time noninstructional professionals (M = 3.00). The extent a spirit of cooperation existed on campus was rated lowest by full-time instructional staff, part-time instructional staff, and full-time administrative staff (M = 2.36, M = 1.00, M = 2.55, respectively). The part-time classified employee group identified as lowest the extent their work area used problem-solving techniques (M = 3.22).

College-wide, the average for collaboration was 3.14. The national average was 3.20.

Work Design. The fifth climate factor was work design. Seven of the eight employee groups rated highest the extent they perceived that their job was important to the goals of the college. These groups and their means were (a) full-
time classified (M = 4.40), (b) part-time classified (M = 4.55), (c) full-time instructors (M = 4.54), (d) part-time instructors (M = 5.0), (e) part-time administrators (M = 4.5), (f) full-time noninstructional professionals (M = 4.44), and (g) part-time noninstructional professionals (M = 3.92). Full-time administrators rated highest the extent they were comfortable working in an ethically and culturally diverse environment (M = 4.61).

The lowest rated work design item (or the top priority for change) for five employee groups was the extent opportunities existed for advancement. These groups and their means were (a) part-time classified (M = 3.44), (b) part-time instructional staff (M = 1.00), (c) part-time administrators (M = 3.50), (d) full-time noninstructional professional staff (M = 2.90), and (e) part-time noninstructional professional staff (M = 3.00). The extent managers provided assistance for improvement was rated lowest by full-time instructional staff and full-time administrative staff (M = 2.91, M = 3.22, respectively). Full-time classified staff rated lowest the extent their work was guided by clearly defined processes (M = 2.90).
The college-wide average on work design was 3.79. No national data were available for this climate factor.

**Student Focus.** The highest rated item for three employee groups was the extent student needs were central to their job. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified staff ($M = 3.90$), (b) part-time instructional staff ($M = 5.00$), and (c) part-time administrative staff ($M = 4.00$). The extent ethically and culturally diverse issues were part of the curriculum was ranked highest by full-time administrators and part-time noninstructional professional staff ($M = 3.68$, $M = 4.00$, respectively). Both full-time instructional employees and full-time noninstructional professional staff rated as highest ($M = 3.95$, $M = 3.60$) the extent students were comfortable in the environment. Part-time classified staff ranked highest the extent they believed students were pleased with their educational experience at NCC ($M = 4.00$).

Five employee groups rated as lowest (or the top priority for change) the extent administrative personnel met the needs of NCC students. These groups and their means were (a) full-time classified ($M = 3.00$), (b) part-time
classified (M = 3.44), (c) full-time instructional staff, (M = 2.90), (d) part-time instructional staff (M = 1.00), and (d) full-time noninstructional professional staff (M = 2.84). Full-time administrators ranked lowest the extent professors met the needs of students. The extent students were comfortable in the college environment was rated as lowest by part-time administrators (M = 3.00). Part-time noninstructional professional staff identified as lowest the extent the college prepared students for transfer or a career (M = 3.14).

For student focus, the college-wide mean was 3.49. No national data were available for this climate factor.

The mean for four of the six climate factors (formal influence, communication, collaboration, and organizational structure) for all employee groups was 3.32, and the national mean was 3.31.

Recommendations for change were determined by the difference or the spread between the "'ideal' situation represented by a mean or score of 4.50" (PACE Survey, 1994, p. 26) and the mean for each item. "The gap between the scores on 'what is' and 'what should be' for each item is the zone of acceptable change. . ." (PACE Survey Report,
The top priorities for change for Northeastern Community College and those that appeared as areas of mutual concern across all employee groups are shown in Table 5. The top priorities for change were those items that had means less than 3.50.

For all employees, the factor with the lowest mean was the communication factor ($M = 2.95$); and the work design factor had the highest mean ($M = 3.90$). The College average on all climate factors for all employee groups was 3.34. Since the PACE Survey "ideal" representing a participatory style of management is 4.50, the distance between NCC's college-wide mean of 3.34 and the ideal indicated that the College was not engaged in participatory governance.
TABLE 5.
NORTHEASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group received adequate information from other departments</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and current information shared with those who make decisions</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A spirit of cooperation existed</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared campus-wide</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made at level where most adequate and accurate information available</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group problem-solving techniques used</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable behaviors identified and communicated</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration met student needs</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of ability to influence college direction</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees worked as a team</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development encouraged</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive work expectations communicated</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College actions reflected college goals</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Self-Study Recommendations**

The self-study final report was completed and submitted to the Board of Trustees of NCC in March, 1995. The early years of Northeastern Community College were marked by its
struggle for survival. When the College first opened in 1973, 400 students were enrolled; and classes were held in a car dealership showroom (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 16). The College was one of the first in its state located in the center of a large city. The student population was predominately people of color, people who speak English as a second language, and recent immigrants.

Due to the inner-city population the College served, the self-study team stated that the mission of the College was unique. The College's mission specifically addressed "those who have been historically deprived of, and now aggressively seek, quality public education" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 22). The College's struggle for resources, physical facilities, and survival continued throughout the 1970s.

By the early 1980s, "the battlefield shifted from the external to the internal" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 16). The College had three presidents in nine years, and between 1989 and 1992 had four presidents. "The high administrative turnover seriously impacted institutional stability and development, resulting in low morale and distrust among College employees" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 17). The President in office at the time of this study assumed office
in 1992, and the "College has taken significant steps to improve" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 17).

This turbulent history and an accompanying large-scale personnel turnover caused a lack of consistency in existing policies and procedures, implementation of plans, and consistent decision making based upon planning, evaluation, and input from all employees (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 33). Although the College instituted a governance body in which all employee groups were represented, employees were unable to communicate effectively. As a result, employees could not reach consensus on important issues. The self-study team recommended that efforts be undertaken to improve relations among administration, faculty, staff, and other constituencies. The team also recommended that the College strengthen the role of the governing body as a forum for communication (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 33).

Another recommendation of the self-study team was that processes for screening committees for new faculty and tenure be strengthened and fully implemented. The team further stated that leadership of the branch campus must be established; and the program review process and the conflict resolution committee (both interrupted due to personnel
turnover) must be reinstated. The team also recommended that processes be developed and implemented to facilitate communication and information sharing and to ensure broad-based, timely, and efficient operational decisions (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 35).

Frequent turnover in leadership and other personnel had negatively impacted the planning and evaluation processes at NCC. The self-study team recommended that the budgeting process be more closely aligned with academic programs and the mission of the College. The team also stated that the College must ensure that academic affairs and student services planning occur more frequently and be guided by long-term and short-term goals (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 29).

The self-study team also recommended that personnel evaluation processes and use of the evaluation results in personnel decisions must be developed and implemented. Additionally, the team stated that a process to identify, collect, analyze, and use data to enhance planning must be designed and implemented (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 29).

Lack of funding had consistently hampered curriculum development and improvement. This lack of funding also
prevented the College from purchasing and maintaining current library resources, computer, media, and duplication equipment (Self-Study Report, p. 69). Student advising must also be expanded to meet the needs of academically disadvantaged students. Additionally, the College must implement a more comprehensive student assessment and advising procedure. Developmental courses must be redesigned to ensure "sequential competency acquisition" (Self-Study Report, p. 49, 1995).

The high turnover in personnel and low funding also affected NCC faculty. Although many faculty were interested in professional development and demonstrated this interest by attending seminars, workshops, and conferences, no process was established to allocate funding or leave time. Faculty perceived that the existing process of awarding funds, release time, and travel was not accessible or equitable. The self-study team stated that this perception was caused by (a) the lack of a clear application process for release time and/or funding; (b) the lack of a publication on availability of fellowships; and (c) the lack of documentation of the College's commitment to faculty development. The self-study team, therefore, recommended
that equitable professional development policies and procedures be developed, published, and implemented (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 54-56).

Inequity in faculty work loads, salary scales, advising responsibilities, and inconsistency in faculty search committees were also concerns of the self-study team. Recommendations to address these concerns and their impact on curriculum development were that the College must (a) implement a strategic planning process for curriculum development, (b) train part-time faculty to assist full-time faculty with advising, (c) re-evaluate faculty salary and benefits and align these with similar, competitor institutions; and (d) standardize search committees to ensure equity, consistency, and functionality (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 56).

Fiscal problems also affected the effectiveness of NCC's learning resources center. Library collections were not current, and the media collection was also poorly maintained and inadequate. The self-study team recommended that the College must (a) develop and implement a process to ensure upgrading library collections and media equipment, (b) develop and implement a survey process to determine resource
materials that faculty needed, and (c) devise a budgeting plan to ensure upgrading of computer technology (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 69).

The external and internal turmoil experienced by NCC also caused high turnover in staffing for student support services. Insufficient staff created by this high turnover as well as increasing enrollment caused limited and inconsistent services. College publications were also inadequate, and the computer system did not produce reliable student data. The self-study team recommended that additional staff be hired as soon as possible. Additionally, the team recommended that computer needs be assessed to ensure the purchase of a system to produce reliable and accurate data (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 64).

Limited fiscal resources also impacted the facilities at NCC. Buildings were constantly in need of repair, and funding was unavailable for timely and adequate repairs. In addition, financial management systems were inefficient due to the lack of budgeting processes, out-dated and limited computer systems, and frequent and high personnel turnover. The self-study team recommended that the College (a) analyze its efficiency in its use of available resources, (b)
develop and implement internal fiscal control policies and procedures to ensure continuity, (c) establish a broad-based financial management council, (d) purchase and install a computer system to integrate with enrollment management systems, and (e) provide reliable and complete financial information (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 74).

The public image of the College also had suffered due to inconsistency in leadership. Publications were handled by off-campus agencies or on an ad hoc basis. The self-study team recommended that a full-time public relations professional be hired to coordinate publications and external relations (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 83).

Out-dated computer technologies and other equipment in addition to the high turnover in personnel created additional problems. Systems were not designed to ensure timely publication and implementation of policies and procedures. "As a result some policies failed to be fully implemented . . . others were being duplicated or reinvented . . . many of the College's good initiatives were . . . aborted" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 85). The self-study team indicated that the College must ensure (a) that policies and procedures be disseminated in a timely manner,
and (b) that supervisors be trained to effectively implement policies.

Although the mission of NCC had not changed for over 20 years, the self-study team identified threats to the ability of NCC to fulfill its mission. These threats were (a) inadequate funding, (b) faculty development and accessibility, (c) diverse skill levels of students, (d) tuition costs, and (e) meager academic support services (Self-Study Report, 1995, pp. 20-24).

To address these threats to attaining the mission, the self-study team recommended that the College implement an effective student skills assessment program and a stronger general core curriculum. Upgrading library, computer, and instructional facilities and equipment was also recommended by the team. Additional staffing was also required to facilitate computer services college-wide. Finally, the self-study team recommended that the College mission be reviewed and discussed annually. This annual review would enable new employees to gain knowledge and ownership of the mission (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 25).

The team indicated that the College must respond to the issues identified if it is to continue to fulfill its
mission "to serve the higher education and community-learning needs of . . . area residents, particularly those who have been historically deprived of . . . quality public education" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 22).

Reaffirmation Team Report

The reaffirmation or accrediting agency team report was published after the team review of the self-study report and the team visit to the NCC campus in April, 1995.

The team expressed concern about the "consensus that supports the mission, and the institution's balance in addressing it" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 3). Community needs identified by the College included the preparation of students to enter business and industry. The team, however, indicated that the primary focus of NCC was the transfer of students with "very few career and technical programs offered" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 4). The team also recommended that the College use outcomes data to establish the various populations the College served and how the needs were met.

The reaffirmation team also indicated that the College had "a long-term pattern of poor financial management"
(Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 17). Policies and procedures of the Board of Trustees of the College also needed to be codified to ensure that legal responsibilities of the Board were met. The need for timely, accurate, and consistent communication to all employees was also a concern of the reaffirmation team. Personnel policies and procedures were not clearly written or available to College employees. The team was also concerned that the branch campus did not appear to have a clearly established role in the College mission, and the position of the branch campus administrator was not included on the organizational chart.

The lack of a consistent evaluation of College programs and services was of concern to the team. Some programs had been reviewed; however, others either had not completed a review or the review was incomplete. Policies, procedures, and assessment measures were not clearly communicated or understood by all constituencies. In addition, the high turnover in personnel caused many policies either to be partially implemented or not implemented at all. The team was also unsure about whether data collected by various departments were communicated to all employees and whether
or not the data were used in program planning and improvement.

Communication, both college-wide and interdepartmentally, was also of concern to the reaffirmation team. Additionally, the lack of input into key decisions and the budgeting process were identified as concerns. A formal plan for faculty development outlining clear policies and procedures regarding priorities and access to faculty development funds was not available. College-wide policies also were not disseminated to all employees. To address these concerns, the team recommended the development and implementation of (a) a plan for faculty development; (b) a process to ensure proper credentialing of current and new faculty; (c) a plan to improve communications such as budgeting information, dissemination of minutes, actions of the Board of Trustees, and position and structural changes; and (d) a process to ensure "consistent instructional continuity of all credit courses" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 27). Further, the team recommended that the President of NCC schedule and attend meetings with the faculty organization as well as with
individual faculty to ensure this employee group's input into key academic issues.

Reaffirmation team concerns for the student services division of the College were (a) inconsistency in leadership resulting from the high turnover in personnel, (b) lack of a team approach to problem solving within the division, and (c) the lack of evidence that the College mission was not used in establishing the unit's goals and objectives. In addition, there seemed to be no accurate assessment of unit or personnel activities to determine their efficiency or effectiveness. These concerns prompted the reaffirmation team to recommend that leadership of the division must (a) establish routine meetings with staff, (b) improve communication to all members of the division, and (c) develop and implement a plan to unite the division and engender a sense of purpose among the work units. The team also recommended that leadership of the student services division respond to staff concerns and needs. In addition, the team indicated that "a student-centered focus to daily activities would help eliminate student perceptions of unresponsiveness, particularly by leadership offices" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 31).
The turmoil created by the high turnover of personnel and a large number of staff in "acting" positions also caused problems in the learning resources center. The team recommendations for the center were that (a) additional staffing was needed for both the main campus and the branch campus, (b) increased funding was necessary to enable the College to meet student and community needs, (c) updated equipment and service contracts must be purchased, and (d) adequate seating must be provided to accommodate current and projected student needs. The reaffirmation team also recommended that the learning resources center "join a library consortium to adequately serve" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 37) its constituencies.

Although the reaffirmation team indicated the NCC campus was "a smoothly integrated whole that, for the most part, works extremely well as designed" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 38), the team identified several areas of concern. These concerns were (a) inadequate facility cleaning, (b) inefficient allocation of classroom space, (c) unresolved issues of funding and control for a new off-campus facility, and (d) the years in which a costly television studio was vacant.
Of primary concern to the reaffirmation team was the financial instability of the College. Although the self-study process identified many of the reasons for this financial instability and addressed some of them, the reaffirmation team indicated that "... the corrective actions anticipated are unlikely to be sufficient to prevent further deterioration of the fiscal health of the College" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 42).

The team indicated that the College should (a) restore a balanced budget, (b) rebuild reserve funds to tide the college over periods of financial emergency, (c) develop and implement fiscal controls, and (d) improve the collection and dissemination of accurate and timely data to College decision makers. (Two separate pieces of financial data supplied to the reaffirmation team showed the College had a deficit exceeding $1.05 million and an operating surplus of over $200,000 for the same fiscal year.)

Further recommendations of the reaffirmation team were that (a) procedures and policies should be reviewed, revised as needed, and consistently implemented; (b) departmental processes should be written to provide continuity when personnel turnover occurred; and (c) processes should be
developed and implemented to provide all employees access to consistent, accurate, and timely information.

Although the team identified many strengths, it also recognized that NCC must "face economic reality and improve its resource allocation methodology" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 45) if the College is to attain stability. Additionally, the College must also develop and implement methods to ensure further stability and continuity of processes, programs, and services when personnel change. The reaffirmation team's final recommendation for NCC was that it receive reaccreditation.

**Interviews with Selected College Employees**

Letters requesting an appointment for a telephone interview were mailed in early July, 1996 to 33 employees representing all segments of Northeastern Community College. Letters were returned for three people who were no longer employed at the College. No responses were received from the remaining 30.

Follow-up telephone calls to nonrespondents were placed in early August, mid-August, the first and middle of September and in early October. Voice mail messages were
left for those away from their telephones each time follow-up calls were made, and it was determined that two more employees had left the College. Of those who answered the follow-up calls, four made appointments for an interview, and six indicated they did not wish to contribute. Several did not remember completing the PACE Survey or seeing the results. Two confirmed appointments for an interview; however, neither answered the telephone at the time of the scheduled interview nor responded to the messages left on voice mail.

By early October, 1996, only four interviews had been completed. One of the interviewees indicated that the researcher would likely be unable to conduct any more interviews because

we are in crisis. The Board of Trustees has asked our President to resign as a result of a vote of "no confidence" by faculty and staff. Media representatives have tricked some staff and faculty members into making comments which were then published in local newspapers. Everyone is suspicious (Professional Staff Interview, October, 1996).
Of the four employees interviewed, one employee was classified staff, two were professional staff, and one was faculty. Of these four interviewees, two did not remember the PACE survey results and were mailed a copy of the priorities for change identified by the PACE survey prior to the interview. Receipt of the survey results prior to the interview might have prompted these two employees to agree that the priorities for change were accurate and were also identified by other data sources. Of the two who remembered the survey, one (professional staff) indicated that the survey results were not distributed to employees; however, a copy was placed in the library for employees to review. There was some question as to whether or not employees were notified that the results were available for their review.

When questioned regarding the accuracy of the PACE survey results, three of the four (two Professional Staff and one Faculty) indicated that they believed the results to be pretty accurate, and one indicated the survey results were "about 50% accurate" (Classified Staff, October, 1996).

The next question to which interviewees responded was the areas of needed change identified by both the climate survey and the reaffirmation team. All four indicated that
communications was identified by both as an area in which change was needed. One interviewee (Professional Staff) indicated that communications was a problem college-wide and "especially communication initiated by the administration" (Professional Staff, September, 1996). Another indicated that communications "particularly from the top down" (Faculty, October, 1996) were inadequate. Another respondent (Professional Staff) said that the majority of the issues identified by the survey was also identified by the reaffirmation team.

In response to the question concerning areas of needed change identified by the survey which were surprises, three (Classified Staff and two Professional Staff) indicated that they were not surprised with the results. One interviewee (Faculty) indicated surprise that there was a perception that the College did not support professional development.

When questioned regarding the extent the survey results were accurate, all four agreed that it was pretty accurate. One interviewee (Professional Staff) indicated that there is a little more spirit of cooperation and team work than this reflects, but I don't think that the administration is part of that. I think it is primarily
within certain departments or divisions where you would find this spirit of teamwork and cooperation (Professional Staff, October, 1996).

In response to the question regarding expectations they had about the survey results, one interviewee (Classified Staff) indicated no memory of completing the survey. Two respondents (Faculty and Professional Staff) had no particular expectations, and one (Professional Staff) indicated that information generated by the survey was needed for the self-study report. Additionally, this interviewee indicated that "a lot of people felt good about being asked to voice their opinions even though they had lots of reservations that the information would actually be used" (Professional Staff, September, 1996).

When responding to the question about how the survey results were used in planning, one interviewee indicated that the College was trying to correct some of the problems. Another respondent indicated no knowledge of whether or not the results were used in any planning. One indicated that I personally believe that, if we had followed some of the priorities and actually did some planning and implemented the results, I am sure there would have been
some positive changes. Unfortunately not much of this happened. The survey results sit in the drawers (Professional Staff, September, 1996).

Another said "we did have activities on team building and cooperation . . . we are not doing any of these things now" (Professional Staff, October, 1996).

When questioned about the frequency at which climate surveys should be administered, three interviewees (two Professional Staff and one Classified Staff) indicated the survey should be conducted each year. One of these respondents also indicated that these survey results would be valuable in providing "continuity, especially with new administration coming in, a little bit gets done on areas in which change is needed, then it gets dropped" (Professional Staff, October, 1996). Another interviewee indicated that rather than a frequency of administration issue, it was an issue of whether or not the survey results would be used in planning for change. "I don't think we really ever got started. Because we were a little above the national average, everyone got the idea that we are okay" (Professional Staff, September, 1996).
In response to the final interview question that sought the perception of employee ownership in the mission of the College, all four interviewees indicated that employees "seem bound around trying to assist students with meeting their needs" (Professional Staff, October, 1996). Additionally, one respondent indicated that when it came to meeting the needs of students, people "would put aside their emotions and disagreements" (Professional Staff, September, 1996). These three interviewees also indicated that they believed their jobs were important in helping the College achieve its mission.

The common priorities for change identified by all data sources for NCC are shown in Table 6.
TABLE 6.
NORTHEASTERN COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMMON PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work group received adequate information from other departments</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate, current information shared with decision makers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A spirit of cooperation exists</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared campus-wide</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions made at level where most accurate/current information available</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group used problem-solving techniques</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable behaviors identified and communicated</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration met student needs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of ability to influence direction of the college</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees worked as a team</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development encouraged</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive work expectations communicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College actions reflected college goals</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data sources: (A) PACE Climate Survey, (B) Self-Study Team Report, (C) Reaffirmation Team Report, and (D) Employee Interviews.
CHAPTER 6
COMPARISONS AND DISCUSSIONS OF DATA RESULTS
FOR ALL THREE INSTITUTIONS

This chapter contains discussions and comparisons among the three colleges. "Data analysis is the process of making sense out of one's data" (Merriam, 1988, p. 127), of linking and compressing data into a narrative that "makes sense to the reader" (Merriam, 1988, p. 130). Patterns and regularities in the data become categories into which other data are sorted. The number of categories depends upon the data, and the frequency in which issues appear indicate their importance (Merriam, 1988).

The initial categories of data for each of the three colleges in this study were the priorities for change identified by employee responses to climate survey statements representing particular climate factors. These factors were formal influence, organizational structure, communication, collaboration, work design, and student focus. The priorities for change were those items with averages or means below 3.50, a standard set for the PACE survey.
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A focus of this study (and the first research question) was "What were the top priorities for change identified by the climate survey?" Tables 1, 3, and 5 list top priorities for change for each College that were determined by employee responses to the climate survey. Middles States Community College employees identified 13 priorities for change, Midwestern Technical College employees identified 12 priorities for change, and Northeastern Community College employees identified 13 priorities for change. These top priorities were those items that had means less than the 3.50 established by the PACE as the standard against which all item means were compared. Those priorities for change determined by employee responses to the survey that were common to the three other data sources for each College (the self-study team report, the reaffirmation team report, and interview data) confirmed that the PACE Climate Survey results can identify priorities for change (Tables 2, 4, and 6).

The second research question was "What major problems identified by the climate survey were also identified in recommendations or suggestions of the reaffirmation team?" Climate survey data and reaffirmation team reports were
compared to respond to this question. Of the priorities for change identified by the employees at Middle States Community College, only one of 13 priorities for change appeared in the reaffirmation team report. This priority for change was the extent of involvement in decisions affecting the employee (Table 2). The reaffirmation team at Midwestern Technical College referenced seven of the 12 priorities for change that were identified by employee reaction to the climate survey. These priorities were the extent (1) information was shared in a timely manner, (2) college-wide, cross-functional teams utilized problem-solving techniques, (3) work was guided by clearly defined administrative processes, (4) opportunities existed for advancement, (5) quality feedback was received, (6) adequate information was received, and (7) sufficient feedback was received (Table 4). Northeastern Community College's reaffirmation team listed 12 of the 13 priorities noted by employee responses to the survey. These 12 priorities were the extent (1) work groups received adequate information from other departments, (2) accurate, current information was shared with decision makers, (3) a spirit of cooperation existed, (4) information was shared campus-wide, (5)
decisions were made at the level where the most accurate and current information was available, (6) work groups used problem-solving techniques, (7) unacceptable behaviors were identified and communicated, (8) administration met student needs, (9) of employee ability to influence direction of the college, (10) employees worked as a team, (11) professional development was encouraged, and (12) college actions reflected college goals (Table 6).

Climate survey data were also used to determine if climate means (faculty and staff morale) enabled the College to implement changes prior to the examination of the College for reaccreditation. This responds to research question three, "How can faculty and staff morale scores be utilized to help identify potential recommendations affecting reaffirmation?" Those priorities for change identified by employee responses to the climate survey that were not referenced in the reaffirmation team report apparently were those in which change had occurred between the time the survey results were available and the reaffirmation team visit occurred. In these instances, it appeared that morale scores were used by the colleges to plan for corrective measures; therefore, these same priorities were not
referenced in the reaffirmation team report. An example of corrective measures at MSCC was that, in response to a perceived lack of information, a monthly newsletter was developed and published and minutes of the Operations Council were routinely distributed across campus. Additional examples for all three colleges and discussions of planned change initiatives resulting from employee input to the survey were discussed in Chapter Five as well as in response to research question five later in this chapter.

Information generated by interview data was used for research question four which was "What was the perception of the employees interviewed at each college regarding the accuracy of the information generated by the climate survey?" The respondents of all three colleges indicated that survey results were either "right on target" or "pretty accurate." Others indicated that the survey results were "very, very accurate." None of the employees indicated that the survey results did not accurately project the college climate.

Most of the interviewees for all three colleges indicated that the results were "pretty much what they expected." Two interviewees at MSCC (President and Dean)
and MTC (Faculty and Professional and Technical Support Staff) indicated that they had no expectations about the results, that they viewed the survey results as another piece of data to confirm what they already knew.

Employees at all three colleges, for the most part, indicated that there were no priorities for change identified which surprised them. Employees at MSCC and MTC indicated that they were surprised that the climate was shown to be so low, and most believed that the climate was higher than the survey portrayed. One interviewee at NCC (Faculty) indicated surprise about only one priority for change, the perceived lack of opportunity for staff development.

The self-study report, reaffirmation team report, and interview data were compared to survey results to determine whether or not the results were used in planning at the Colleges to develop and implement change initiatives to address the identified priorities for change. Those priorities for change that appeared in all four sources of data (Tables 2, 4, and 6) were those in which no change had occurred. Use of employee responses to the survey was evident in planning to effect change at two of the three
colleges. The following discussion of the change initiatives implemented at each college informs research question five, "How were the results of the survey used in institutional planning?"

Priorities for Change and Resulting Change for Each College

The priorities for change and the change initiatives for each College are discussed separately in the following section.

Middle States Community College

The 13 top priorities for change (shown in Table 1) for Middle States Community College were spread among five of the six climate factors as follows: (a) two were in the formal influence or decision-making factor, (b) one was in the organizational structure climate factor, (c) four were in the collaboration factor, (d) three were in the communication factor, and (e) three were in the work design factor.

The three priorities for change from the communication factor were identified by College employees as those least in need of change or the items with the least spread between the mean and the "ideal system" for the PACE survey.
These three priorities for change in communication, the three priorities for change affecting the work design and the four priorities for change affecting the collaborative climate factors were more readily understood by the researcher after finding that the climate survey was conducted during a change in administration, a reorganization, and a reduction in force.

In response to employee concern about communications, a newsletter was developed and routinely published by the College. Additionally, there was a greater commitment by the administration to improving technologies at the College. E-mail and other technologies were used to enhance communications. A matrix or managerial grid system was implemented and training was conducted for employees to enable them to "keep track of issues so they (issues) are not allowed to get lost" (Associate Professor, 1996). Some employees had the perception that the reorganization had improved communications because "our organization is flatter" and "our President is a 'hands-on' administrator. He actually visits our offices and classes." (Professor, 1996). Further, the reaffirmation team report stated that completion of a climate survey during such change was
"indicative of openness of the College to listening and learning from everyone in the institution" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1994, p. 4).

Two items were identified by employee groups of MSCC as having the highest (or the ones in least need of improvement) priority for change. These were (a) the extent of involvement in decisions personally affecting the employee, and (b) the extent cooperation existed across various academic departments. The "gap" or distance from the PACE ideal system (represented by a mean of 4.50) and these top two priorities for change (each with a mean of 3.0, one formal influence and one collaboration) was 1.5. The President stated that the climate survey "led me to see that we needed to address their concern about a lack of input" (Interview, August, 1996). In response to this lack of opportunity for input, the President expanded the Operations Council to include support staff—an employee group that had never had any representation in the decision making process. The Operations Council became the forum to which all issues and recommendations of task forces and committees were presented.
Further evidence that Middle States Community College used data from the climate survey to make needed changes prior to the visit by the reaffirmation team is presented in Table 2. Of the 13 priorities for change identified by employee responses to the survey, only three were identified by the self-study team and only one was identified by the reaffirmation or reaccrediting agency team. Only one of the 13 was identified by all four data sources (the PACE survey, the self-study team, the reaccrediting agency team, and interviewees) as a priority for change. This was the extent of involvement in decisions affecting the employee. The self-study report, the reaffirmation team report, and interviewees all indicated, however, that the implementation of the Operations Council that included representation of all employee groups had addressed this concern.

Additionally, the range of the averages or means of all items identified as top priorities for change was 3.00 (top priority for change) to 3.4 (the items needing the least amount of change). Seven of the 13 priorities for change had means of 3.4 and were those ranked as needing the least amount of change.
Midwestern Technical College

Employee groups at Midwestern Technical College identified 12 priorities for change (Table 4). These priorities for change also were spread among five of the six climate factors. Three climate factors, (formal influence, work design, and collaboration) each had two priorities for change; and the organizational structure and communication factors both had three items or priorities for change.

MTC also had experienced a recent change in presidents. The new President came in 1993, and the climate survey was conducted in 1994. Some structural change also had occurred prior to the survey such as the restructuring of the student services department and the reorganization of counseling and advising services. The previous president had also "flattened" the organization. This "flattening" created perceptions among certain employees that "mid-management was not involved in meetings. . . and decision making" (Dean, 1996). This flattening of the organization, new leadership, and subsequent restructuring contributed to the identification of the priorities for change that impacted the organizational structure, work design, and formal influence climate factors. Additionally, the lack of a
faculty appraisal process contributed to two of the priorities for change (the lack of sufficient and quality feedback) affecting these climate factors.

The College addressed these concerns with a continued emphasis on implementation of total quality management principles. The new President "consistently utilizes extensive teams along with the executive cabinet. This style is encouraged by the President for use by all other managers" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 6). The President has also created a strategic leadership team and "since then we have been operating more in the shared governance mode" (Dean, 1996).

Although these efforts to improve the involvement of employees have been successful to a degree, there were indications that there were those who perceived that "the administration needs to walk the talk, not just talk the walk" (Faculty, 1996). Other interviewees also indicated that more follow-through was needed "to ensure that all interested parties are part of the process and the decisions that impact them" (Vice President, 1996). There were also some interviewees who had perceptions that the President is "not really clear" about how he expects teams to be involved
in governance. "Teams have no authority to implement needed change" (Instructor, 1996).

There were, however, indications that many employees believed that the continuous improvement language and principles were actually becoming more of a philosophy to the President and College family. Employees indicated that "quality takes a lot of training and work" (Associate Dean, 1996), and "an attempt is being made to push decision making" (Professional Staff, 1996) to the appropriate level.

The College had also made efforts to improve communications. The College has extensively used the mainframe computer for communications. E-mail, internet, voice mail, and additional training have been implemented. An information "help desk" was also created to provide immediate assistance to the staff and visitors (Associate Dean, 1995).

The changes above also addressed the top priority for change at MTC. This priority for change, with a mean of 2.94, was the extent information was shared so that decision makers had accurate and current information. The distance from the "ideal" (4.50) for PACE and this top priority for change was 1.56. Further evidence that the College had
addressed this communication concern was that the reaffirmation team stated that "the Strategic Leadership Team function of team decision making also facilitates communication and reduces conflict" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 7).

Of the 12 priorities for change for MTC, the one needing change the least or the lowest priority for change was the extent a spirit of cooperation existed (collaboration factor) on campus. An indication of the change that had already occurred in collaboration was evidenced by the reaffirmation team report. The reaffirmation team stated that "the adversarial relationship noted by the evaluation team of 1985 was not observed" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 7).

Six of the 12 priorities for change for Midwestern Technical College were identified by all four data sources (Table 4), and two were identified by three of the data sources. This consensus along with the perception of a lack of trust indicated by some interviewees indicated that the College was not as open to change as employees desired. The range of the averages or mean scores of the 12 priorities for change was 2.94 to 3.36. (Items with means below 3.5,
the standard for the PACE survey, were identified as the top priorities for change.)

Northeastern Community College

Northeastern Community College employee groups identified 13 priorities for change that were spread among five of the six climate factors. The organizational structure and the student focus climate factors each had one priority for change. The formal influence and collaboration climate factors each had three priorities for change, and the communication climate factor had five priorities for change.

Northeastern Community College had experienced much turbulence within the last several years. As noted in the preceding chapter, there were four presidents between 1989 and 1992. The College has also struggled for adequate fiscal resources since its beginning. The instability in leadership and inadequate financial resources caused a high turnover in personnel college-wide. The frequent and continued turnover in personnel caused communications to be piecemeal. Policies and procedures also were only partially implemented or were not implemented at all. Branch campuses
were not integrated with the College in academic programs, credit programs, learning resources center services, or faculty evaluations (Self-study report, 1995, p. 18).

The College had two comprehensive visits from its accrediting agency; one in 1980 and one in 1985. Additionally, two focused visits by the accrediting agency were completed in 1990 and 1992. Although the President in office at the time of this study had "focused on improving its internal management" (Self-Study Report, 1995, p. 19), there was evidence that many problems either had not been addressed or were only partially addressed due to continuing staff turnover and fiscal instability. One of the priorities for improving internal management for the 1996 fiscal year was "building up the administrative team to establish and enforce lines of responsibility, authority, and accountability" (Self-study report, 1995, p. 35.). Further, the report indicated that the College would develop and implement a process to ensure sharing accurate and adequate information to all employees.

Of the 13 priorities for change identified by the climate survey results, 11 were identified by all four data sources. These are shown in Table 6. Change had either
been minimal or had not occurred at all. One interviewee indicated that the reason the survey was conducted was that we did not have much data to do the self-study report and it (PACE) would generate a lot of information. A lot of people felt good about being asked to voice their opinions even though they had lots of reservations that the information would actually be used. The results were very helpful, but were they instrumental in institutional change? I am not sure. I personally believe that if we had followed some of the priorities and actually did some planning and implemented it, I am sure there would have been some positive changes.

Unfortunately, not much of this happened. The survey results sit in the drawer (Professional Staff, 1996).

Further evidence of the continuing instability of the College was the statement of an interviewee that "we are in crisis" (Professional Staff, 1996).

Although the top priority for change for NCC was the extent work groups received adequate information from other departments, this priority for change was reflective of the serious, in-depth problems the College had and was continuing to face. The "gap" or the distance from the
ideal mean of 4.50 for the PACE survey was 2.01. The range of averages or mean scores for the 13 priorities for change was 2.49 to 3.32.

**Common Priorities for Change and Resulting Change at the Three Colleges**

The common priorities for change and the climate factors affected by the priority item for all three colleges are shown in Table 7. Only one priority for change was common among all three institutions. This priority was the extent cooperation existed across various academic departments.

For MSCC this priority for change tied with the extent of involvement in decisions personally affecting the employee. In planning to address both these priorities for change, the President expanded the Operations Council to include an employee group that had not had representation in the decision making process. This representation also encouraged cooperation among the various employee groups. In addition, the survey results were used in a retreat for all members of the Operations Council and other employees of MSCC to plan other change initiatives. MTC employees indicated that cooperation across various academic
### TABLE 7.

**COMMON PRIORITIES FOR CHANGE FOR ALL THREE COLLEGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority for Change</th>
<th>MSCC</th>
<th>MTC</th>
<th>NCC</th>
<th>Climate Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A spirit of cooperation existed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-wide, cross-functional teams utilized problem-solving</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information shared so decision makers have accurate/current information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate information is received</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of ability to influence college direction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal Influ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent decisions made at appropriate level</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Organ. Struct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departments was their 11th priority for change, and NCC employees ranked it as their third priority for change. The President of MTC also used the results of the survey to plan change. MTC had also implemented a Strategic Leadership Team (similar in composition to that developed by MSCC) that included employees from across all employee groups to increase cooperation and improve communication. Planning...
for change was not clearly evident at NCC; change initiatives were either dropped or implemented piecemeal.

Of greater significance than the number of priorities for change was the commitment to, planning for, and the amount of change that resulted from the identification of priorities for change. Also significant was the identification of the priorities for change by the different data sources (shown in Tables 2, 4, and 6).

Priorities for change identified by all four data sources indicated an absence of change initiatives from the time the survey was administered and employee interviews were conducted. The priorities for change identified by employee responses to the survey which did not appear in the self-study report and/or in the reaffirmation ream report had been resolved by planning and implementation of change initiatives. This was also confirmed by interview responses.

As indicated earlier in this chapter, Middle States Community College responded to the priorities for change by developing and implementing communication processes and by implementing and using an Operations Council. Evidence of the validity of using climate survey data to plan for and
implement change was that the reaffirmation team identified only one of the 13 priorities for change as an area of concern. The College had already initiated a plan for change to address this priority. Further evidence of the "open" environment at MSCC was the perception projected by the interviewees of trust in the leadership, the enthusiasm of the employees for College initiatives, and the confidence that things would, in fact, change as a result of the use of their input in planning.

Midwestern Community College also responded to several of the priorities for change by implementing a strategic leadership group and developing and implementing processes to improve communications. Although these changes were made, there was evidence that additional improvements were necessary. Six of the 12 priorities for change were identified by all four sources of data. Interviewees more consistently projected a perception that teams or committees were organized to address concerns, but the results of the team efforts were never acknowledged or implemented with no explanation as to why not. Cross-functional teams were also not used to effect change as employees perceived they should be. Some interviewees, however, acknowledged that "things
have improved, but you are never there. Communication and involvement can always be improved" (Professional Staff, 1996). Another indicated that "the President has been here three years, and we are really beginning to come together as a team. The President sets the tone for involvement" (Dean, 1996).

Although interviewees at Midwestern Technical College, for the most part, projected confidence in the leadership of the College, the researcher perceived that the environment was not as "open" for input from employees and in planning for change as a result of employee input as that of Middle States Community College.

Of the 13 priorities for change identified by employee responses to the PACE survey at Northeastern Community College, 11 were identified by all four sources of data. Although the College had attempted to implement change, efforts were either piecemeal or dropped entirely due to continued turnover and financial instability. The lack of change was evident in the number and consistency of identification of the priorities for change first by the survey, then the self-study process, the reaffirmation team, and finally by interviewees. Although interviewees
expressed ownership in the mission of the College, it appeared to result from their identification with the students rather than from the employee's ability to have input into the College decision making process. "Everyone seems bound around trying to assist students, with meeting their needs. . ." (Professional Staff, 1996). No faculty handbook existed, thus there was no uniform process to implement policies and procedures. In addition, no plan for professional development existed, and faculty was unaware of the policies, priorities and criteria for the acquisition of funding for professional development. Additionally, one interviewee indicated that "there seems to be a constant, constant 'you-we-they' atmosphere. Faculty and staff say administration does not care. Administration says that faculty leaves every day early and staff fights all the time" (Professional Staff, 1996).

**Frequency of Survey**

Interview data were also used to respond to research question six, *"How did the frequency of climate survey administration prove to be beneficial to planning for change within the institution?"* Of the employees interviewed for
MSCC, nine of the 10 indicated that surveys should be conducted every two years. One (Professor) did not know how frequently climate surveys should be administered. All interviewees indicated that changes were actually initiated at MSCC, that their input was important, and that the results were used by the leaders of the College. "We actually see results" (Professor, 1996).

At MTC, seven of the 10 indicated that frequency of surveys (every three years) was about right. One (Instructor) indicated the survey should be administered every year; and two (Vice President and Faculty) indicated that equally as important as the frequency of administration of climate surveys was that the information be used in planning, that employees actually "see results" (Professor, 1996). "Equally important is what actions are taken to make change" (Vice President, 1996); and "getting the results and doing something with it. . . following up" (Instructor, 1996).

Northeastern Community College employees indicated that the climate survey should be completed every year or maybe every two years. One (Professional Staff) indicated that
"rather than a timing issue, it is that something is actually done with the results" (1996).

Ownership of the College Mission

The final research question was "What factors contributed to individual employee perceptions of ownership in the mission of the institution?" Interview data, self-study reports, and reaffirmation team reports were used for this question.

Employees at Middle States Community College stated a perception of a strong ownership in the College mission. This was evidenced by the commitment to broad-based participation in the development of the mission. The entire College community participated in the development process "which encouraged consensus. . . All employees met in small groups with leaders and discussed the proposed mission and purposes" (Self-Study Report, 1993, p. 17). Additionally, the reaffirmation team stated that

It was apparent to all team members that there was universal pride in the College and a realization of the (College's) unique role in the community. . . (The College) is at the heart of the community which it seeks
to serve in countless ways . . . the people who are the College . . . have made the county their community. . .
(The College) has become an example of the heartbeat of the community that begins at the College and resonates into the corners of the county which the College serves and to the world beyond those borders (Reaffirmation Team Report Summary, 1994, p. 1).

Employees, too, indicated their commitment to and ownership in the MSCC mission. "I could retire now, and I really don't want to. I am excited about what is going on and I want to stay and be a part of it" (Associate Professor, 1996). Others indicated that the environment was "very good" that 39% of the faculty could retire but have not. . . there is an effort by administration to connect with faculty. . . Although one might disagree with some decisions of the President, it cannot be denied that he sees that people are very important and tries to involve them. . . Our President is really committed to the mission of the College and it shows. His commitment encourages our commitment (Associate Professor, 1996).
Other interviewees (Faculty, Associate Professors, Professional Technical Support Staff) indicated they had autonomy in controlling their work and in dealing with students. There was a belief that their decisions were respected and supported. The President actually had attended individual classes, even those classes at sites off the main campus. Interviewees also indicated that employees had input into decision making and they actually could "see results" of their input. Others indicated that "leadership is interactive. . .the climate is excellent" (Professor, 1996). The President is the biggest factor. . . He is very much dedicated to involvement of all in the governance of the College. Because of his dedication, we get involved and it becomes ours and you are not willing to sit on the outside and watch (Support Staff, 1996).

It was evident that this sense of pride was college-wide. Not one of the interviewees expressed any hint of personal dissatisfaction or knowledge of any widespread dissatisfaction among other employees.

Midwestern Technical College employees also indicated a strong ownership of the mission of the College. Here, too,
the College community was involved in an extensive review and revision of the mission statement. Focus groups were conducted and an innovative "computer 'groupware' system was used to brainstorm key words and phrases" (Self-study Report, 1995, p. 26). The reaffirmation team also recognized the wide-spread input into and ownership of the College mission. Additionally, employees indicated that they have ownership of the mission for many reasons. Among these reasons for ownership were input into the processes and shared governance. There is a "philosophy toward more collaboration. . .we have good communication within the College" (Faculty, 1996). Others interviewed indicated broad opportunities existed for involvement in leadership and decision making. "Opportunities are there (for involvement) if people choose to pursue them. . . people can see their daily roles connected to the College" (Professional Technical Support Staff, 1996). Many credited the President and his emphasis on participative governance as the primary impetus for the perception of employee ownership of the College mission.

Although the majority of interviewees indicated a positive connection to the College and ownership in its
mission, there was a perception that the College was "moving backwards toward a more autocratic system" (Faculty, 1996). Another interviewee (support staff) indicated that there were people on campus who believed that, although input was requested and suggestions were made, employees could not actually see any results. Another indicated that some employees were unsure about where the new "President really stands on issues such as the quality effort. He says he supports team efforts, but there is no obvious result of this support" (Faculty, 1996).

Midwestern Technical College employees, overall, had a strong belief in the mission of the College; however, there were indications that all employees did not perceive ownership in the College mission. The overall climate was apparently healthy; however, not as healthy and open as that of Middle States Community College.

Northeastern Community College had experienced much turbulence; however, there seemed to be a strong feeling of ownership in the mission of the College as the mission related to services to students. "Faculty has provided important stability and institutional continuity during recent years of administrative turnover" (Reaffirmation Team
Report, 1995, p. 25). Additionally, one interviewee indicated that "When it comes to service to students, they would put aside their emotions and disagreements" (Professional Staff, 1996).

Although the self-study report indicated that the President was committed to participative governance, the reaffirmation report provided evidence to the contrary.

While the system of governance involves participation of all appropriate constituencies, regular communication among them seem to be a major concern. Members of the visiting team heard from faculty and classified personnel that they felt isolated from the decision-making processes and governance of the institution. Little communication reached below the cabinet level in spite of assurances of the administration that cabinet members were providing minutes and other important documents. Of particular concern was the allegation that top level administrators do not make themselves accessible to meet with groups of employees and students (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 15). Further evidence of an absence of participative governance was the inaccessibility to and unreliability of
budget information. Faculty had no knowledge of budgeting policies and processes, and no faculty development funding information was available. This created the perception among faculty that funding for development was unfairly awarded. Also of concern to the reaffirmation team was "the apparent inability of the fiscal office to provide reliable data as to the fiscal status of the College" (Reaffirmation Team Report, 1995, p. 43).

The concern of the team regarding the lack of communication was corroborated by interviewees. One interviewee indicated that communication was lacking, "particularly that initiated by the Administration" (Faculty, 1996). Another stated that communication was a problem college-wide but "particularly from the top down." (Classified Staff, 1996).

The continued financial instability and turbulence caused by frequent and high turnover of personnel had created a definite lack of trust among employees of the College. As one interviewee stated "people here work under pretty dismal situations; the working environment is not that good, resources are scarce. . ." (Professional Staff, 1996).
Summary of Research Questions and Results

This section of the chapter contains the research questions and a brief summary of the results for each question.

The first research question was "What were the top priorities for change identified by the climate survey?" Employee responses to survey statements for each item in each climate factor were used to establish priorities for change. Those items with the lowest means and for which the means were below 3.50 (or those with greatest distance from the "ideal" 4.50 for the PACE survey) were identified as priorities for change (Tables 1, 3, and 5).

MSCC employees identified 13 priorities for change; three affected the communication climate factor, and three affected the work design climate factor. The formal influence climate factor had two priorities for change, the collaboration climate factor had four, and the organizational structure had one priority for change. Employees at MTC identified 12 priorities for change. The communication and organizational structure climate factors each had three priorities for change; and the collaboration, formal influence, and work design climate factors each had
two. NCC employees identified 13 priorities for change. Five of these priorities impacted the communication climate factor; the formal influence and collaboration climate factors each had three priorities, and the organizational structure and student focus climate factors each had one priority for change.

The second research question was "What major problems identified by the climate survey were also identified in recommendations or suggestions of the reaffirmation team?" Only one of the 13 priorities for change identified by MSCC employee responses to the survey were also identified by the reaffirmation team; however, seven of 12 of the priorities for change identified by MTC employees were also established by the reaffirmation team. Employees at NCC identified 13 priorities for change, 11 of these were also stated by the reaffirmation team.

Research question three was "How can faculty and staff morale scores be used to help identify potential recommendations affecting reaffirmation?"

Priorities for change that were not identified by the reaffirmation team were those in which change had occurred between the climate survey and the reaffirmation team visit.
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Tables 2, 4, and 6 show the priorities that were common across all four data sources.

The answer to the fourth research question, "What was the perception of the employees interviewed at each college regarding the accuracy of the information generated by the climate survey?" was found in interview data. All interviewees at all three colleges indicated that the survey results were accurate. Responses ranged from "very, very accurate" or "right on target" to "pretty accurate."

Answers to research question five, "How were the results of the survey used in institutional planning?" were found in self-study reports, reaffirmation team reports, and interview data. Of the three colleges, MSCC indicated more planning to effect change reflecting employee input from survey data then the others. Although MTC had used some of the employee input, there was still a perception among some employees that specific changes to address the issue were not evident. NCC employees indicated that the survey results "just sit in a drawer."

The response to research questions six, "How did the frequency of climate survey administration prove to be beneficial to planning for change within the institution?"
was consistent among the employees of all three colleges. The response was that the frequency of administration of a climate survey is not as important as evidence of change as a result of employee input, that employees "actually see" change.

Also consistent among all three colleges were the responses to research question seven, "What factors contributed to individual employee perceptions of ownership in the mission of the institution?" All employees indicated that the primary reasons for perceptions of ownership was that they had input into decisions. This was consistent even at the two colleges in which employees indicated either a lesser degree or a total lack of input into the decision making process. Additionally, interviewees indicated that the environment or "tone" for participation into the governance of the college was established by the leader. "The President is involved, his involvement encourages our involvement (Associate Dean, Support Staff, MSCC); "The President sets the tone" (Faculty, MTC).

Additional discussion on the importance of the leader in establishing the environment for participatory governance
along with implications for further research are found in Chapter Seven.
Conclusions

Democratic leadership involves a high degree of joint involvement in the decision process and requires great skill and effort. The effective application of democratic leadership often results in a dramatic decrease in apathy, resentment, and conflict and in increase in motivation, performance, and morale. Trust in others, that is, a belief in man's capacity to solve problems and to act in constructive ways, is perhaps the basic ingredient in building such work relationships (Baumgartel, 1969, p. 49).

The importance of leadership in setting the tone of the environment of the institution was evident in each of the institutions studied. It was obvious that the leadership of Middle States Community College was committed to participative governance. The influence of this participative, democratic leadership was reflected in all four sources of data. Employees had input into the decision
making process, and more importantly they actually could "see results" (Faculty, 1996) of their input.

Further evidence of the openness to and use of employee input to develop and implement change initiatives at MSCC was that only one of the 13 priorities for change identified by the climate survey was identified by the other three sources of data. Had there not been any changes impacting the issues identified, more of the other priorities for change would have appeared in either the self-study report, the reaffirmation team report, the interview data, or all four data sources. This was the case for the other two colleges in this study.

The environment of Midwestern Technical College did not appear as "open" as that of Middle States Community College. There were perceptions of some employees that "our input is requested, however, nothing happens" (Faculty, 1996). This lack of recognition of input indicated to employees that their ideas were unimportant and that leadership did not trust them to solve problems. Thus, employees perceived a lack of input into the decision making processes of the institution, that the College was "closed" to their input. This perception was further demonstrated by the number of
priorities for change identified by all four data sources. Six of the 12 priorities for change were identified. Thus, the leaders of this institution were less receptive to change initiatives than Middle States Community College, and the environment was less healthy for employees.

The environment at Northeastern appeared even more "closed" than that of Midwestern Technical College. All sources of data indicated an absence of employee participation in the governance of the College as well as an absence of trust among all constituencies. Further evidence of the inattention to employee concerns was that 11 of the 13 priorities for change identified by employee responses to the climate survey also were issues that appeared in the self-study report, the reaffirmation team report, and the interviews.

It also became obvious to the researcher that the primary difference among the colleges was whether or not change actually occurred as a result of employee input. Employees at all three colleges indicated that "it is not the frequency of the survey which is important. What is important is what happens with the results" (Professional and Support Staff, 1996). When leaders of the colleges used
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employee input in implementing change initiatives, employees demonstrated positive attitudes toward their roles within the college as well as more confidence and trust in their leadership. It became more evident that true leaders are those who are distinguished by the clarity and persuasiveness of their ideas, the depth of their commitment, and their openness to continually learning more. They do not "have the answer." But they do instill confidence in those around them that, together, "we can learn whatever we need to learn in order to achieve the results we truly desire" (Senge, 1990, p. 359).

**Implications for Further Research**

The colleges selected for this study represented diversity in leadership as well as in climate. Since there was such disparity among the three colleges, a longitudinal study of these same three institutions might provide further evidence of the use of climate survey results to effect positive institutional change. Additionally, a longitudinal study would determine whether or not the positive momentum present at Middle States Community College at the time of
the study will continue. If the President were to resign and the replacement did not employ participatory governance, a longitudinal study would also determine the reaction of College employees to a lesser degree of participatory governance. Further, since the President of Midwestern Technical College had been employed only two years at the time of this study, a longitudinal study could determine whether Midwestern Technical College will continue to improve or whether the perceptions of some employees of a lack of commitment to participatory governance will spread throughout the campus. A longitudinal study would also determine whether or not Northeastern Community College will continue to operate given the magnitude of its problems.

Another implication for study would be whether or not the same disparity of employee morale and institutional climate would be evident across three different types of colleges; a private college, a two-year college, and a university. Additionally, research on the use of different climate instruments at the same three colleges selected for this study would indicate whether or not one climate survey provides a better "picture" of institutional climate than another. (Many institutions use climate survey instruments...
developed in-house for the self-study/reaffirmation process.)

The maturity of the institutions as a selection criteria might be added to the other criteria for further study of these same three colleges. Two of the three institutions in this study were established in the 1960s and have apparently enjoyed stability of leadership and finances. Results of the study showed that the climate of these two institutions was significantly more open and participatory than that of the other institution which was established in 1972. Organizational maturity might have been a significant factor in the more open environment of the two older institutions. If organizational maturity was a factor, further research at these three institutions might indicate the reason two of the institutions appeared more mature than the other.

Over time, methods and processes for accomplishing tasks are developed, and each institution or organization has a "unique arrangement of equipment, material, people, and processes (Dyer & Dyer in French, et al., 1989, p. 644). Operational processes can be altered by rearranging any combination or combinations of equipment, material, people, and processes. Alteration of operational processes then
changes the social system within the institution. These changes affect the method and ability of people to communicate with each other, patterns of management used, and the "way decisions are made" (Dyer & Dyer in French, et al., 1989, p. 644). The more "closed" climate found in the one college might have been caused by a lack of employee continuity that resulted in an inability to determine the correct "mix" of people, material, processes, and equipment and that resulted in the lack of trust evidenced by interview data, the self-study team report, and the reaffirmation team report.

A semi-structured, face-to-face interview process might be employed as an alternative to the structured telephone interviews conducted for this study. This alternative interview technique might provide information impossible to perceive in this study due to the inability of the researcher to perceive and use nonverbal cues.

Another selection criteria that might be used in a similar study would be to focus on those employees nearing or past retirement eligibility. This population could be surveyed to determine the correlation of their perception of employee morale and priorities for change to those
identified by the climate survey results. Interviewees at one institution indicated that evidence of the excellent climate was that a large percentage of their employees could retire but did not because of the positive working conditions of the college. "I could retire now, but I really don't want to. I want to stay and be part of it" (Associate Professor, 1996).

Evidence of long-term financial instability, high and frequent personnel turnover, and other major problems was found in both the self-study team report and the reaffirmation team report of Northeastern Community College. Between 1980 and 1992, the College experienced two comprehensive visits and two focused visits from its accrediting agency. Each of these visits addressed the same significant problems; however, the reaffirmation team, in each instance, recommended reaccreditation of the College. Reaccreditation under these conditions implies that further study is needed to determine (1) given the magnitude of the problems identified for this College, under what conditions would the College not have been reaccredited; (2) whether or not accrediting agency standards are applied equally and objectively to all colleges, (3) whether or not the peer
review process lends itself well to an equitable level of evaluation and interpretation of the standards required by the accrediting agency, (4) whether or not systems of evaluation and reaffirmation actually improve colleges, and (5) the perception of employees of other colleges accredited by the same accrediting agency that continues to reaffirm colleges with long-standing, significant problems.


& Associates (Eds.). *Managing ego energy* (pp. 85-123).

French, W. L., Bell, C. H., Jr., & Zawacki, R. A. (Eds.).


APPENDIX A

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

Institutional Effectiveness Model

(PACE)

Developed for

by

George A. Baker III

© College Planning Systems 1994. This instrument may not be reproduced or used without written permission.

PLEASE READ BEFORE BEGINNING SURVEY

The purpose of this instrument is to obtain the perceptions of administrators, faculty, and staff regarding various aspects of the college environment that have been shown to identify relatively enduring characteristics of the college. For example, these characteristics include perceptions of the overall quality of communication and decision making.

Directions:
Please mark your responses to each item on the separate answer sheet. Throughout the survey, you will be asked to blacken in the letter of the response which most closely describes your college environment. Thinking of your own personal experiences at ____________, blacken in the response on the five-point scale relating to the statement in the various sections of the survey. For example, you would mark "A" if you are very satisfied or "E" if you are very dissatisfied. The letters B, C, and D can be used to reflect your opinion between the two anchors of "A" or "E." If you do not understand a question, or feel that you do not possess enough information to answer it, leave the item blank on your response sheet. Please start at item one and complete all the items in this survey. Use the comments section to expand on your responses as you see fit.

Example:

The emphasis on high task accomplishment at the college

A  B  C  D  E

*Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Formal Influence

1. The extent to which the actions of the college reflect the _______ mission.

2. The extent to which my manager expresses confidence in my work

3. The extent to which I am given quality guidance 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 ___________

10. The extent to which the college has been successful in influencing positive attitudes

Communication

11. The extent to which I am satisfied with the amount of information I receive in my work

12. The extent to which 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 an ethnically and culturally diverse environment is valued

18. The extent to which I receive adequate information about what is going on at __________

19. The extent to which information is shared within the college so that those who make decisions have access to accurate/current information

Collaboration

20. The extent to which I have an opportunity to work jointly with others at __________

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 college teams use problem-solving techniques

24. The extent to which a spirit of cooperation exists at __________

25. The extent to which my work team operates together

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 others
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### Organizational Structure

28. The extent to which college-wide policies guide my work
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

29. The extent to which I receive quality feedback in my work
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

30. The extent to which I receive sufficient feedback in my work
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

31. The extent to which the amount of work I do is appropriate
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

32. The extent to which the variety of work I do is appropriate
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

33. The extent to which I am able to organize my work day
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

34. The extent to which my commitment to the college is encouraged
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

35. The extent to which decisions are made at the appropriate level at ____________
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

### Work Design

36. The extent to which accuracy is expected in my job
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

37. The extent to which my skills are appropriate for my job
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

38. The extent to which I feel my job is relevant to the __________ mission
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

39. The extent to which I am responsible for meaningful work
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

40. The extent to which I have the opportunity for advancement within the college
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

41. The extent to which my work is guided by clearly defined administrative processes
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

42. The extent to which I have an opportunity to succeed
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

43. The extent to which my manager helps me to improve my work
   - A: Very Satisfied  B: Satisfied  C: Neutral/Satisfied  D: Dissatisfied  E: Very Dissatisfied

\[\text{PAGE - 4}\]
44. The extent to which I feel comfortable working at __________

**Student Focus**

45. The extent to which student needs are central to what we do

46. The extent to which students receive a quality education at ______________

47. The extent to which faculty meet the needs of students

48. The extent to which support services personnel meet the needs of students

49. The extent to which administrative personnel meet the needs of students

50. The extent to which the college prepares students for a career

51. The extent to which students are assisted with their personal development

52. The extent to which students' competencies are enhanced

53. The extent to which students are comfortable in the environment

54. The extent to which students are pleased with their educational experience at ______________

55. The extent to which ethnic and cultural diversity are important issues in the curriculum
Demographic information:

56. Ethnicity
   A. African-American
   B. Asian or Pacific Islander
   C. Caucasian
   D. Hispanic
   E. North American Indian

57. How long have you been employed in higher education?
   A. 0 - 4 years
   B. 5 - 9 years
   C. 10 - 14 years
   D. 15 - 19 years
   E. 20 or more years

58. How long have you been employed by this college?
   A. 0 - 4 years
   B. 5 - 9 years
   C. 10 - 14 years
   D. 15 - 19 years
   E. 20 or more years

59. What is your role on this campus?
   A. Administrative Services
   B. Instructional Services
   C. Economic Development/Marketing
   D. Human Resources
   E. Student Services

60. In which area do you work? (Select one answer from the next two questions)
   A. Business Services
   B. Instructional Services
   C. Student Services
   D. College Development
   E. President's Office/Human Resources

61. In which area do you work (continued)?
   A. Community Education/
      Economic Development
   B. Information and Technical Services
   C. Other

Please provide any comments which you feel may be important to the overall assessment of your college environment (you may attach a separate sheet.)
APPENDIX B

Letter to Institutions Requesting
Permission to Use Data
Dear

As we discussed on the telephone today, I am collecting data for my doctoral dissertation. The subject of my dissertation is the relationship between employee morale and institutional effectiveness.

The method I plan to use in studying individual employee perception of institutional climate as related to institutional effectiveness is as follows. I plan to study employee perception of the climate of the institution as reflected in data collected using Dr. George Baker's Personal Assessment of the College Environment (PACE) Survey in comparison to the self-study report, the report institution's receive from the regional accrediting agency's reaffirmation team, and data generated from interviews with selected employees. One hypothesis I would like to study is that institutions that administer a climate survey prior to the self-study process may use survey data to pinpoint problem areas and make needed changes thus preventing the institution from receiving certain recommendations from the reaffirmation team.

As I mentioned in our conversation today, the items I would like to study from your institution are the PACE survey results, your institution's self-study report, and the report your institution received from the reaffirmation team of your regional accrediting organization. I assure you that all information will be kept confidential, and institutions will be assigned fictional names. I will also
October 31, 1995

be happy to provide a copy of the results to your institution if you wish.

I appreciate your consideration of my request and thank you in advance for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Connie S. Buckner
APPENDIX C

Letter Requesting Interview
July 5, 1996

Dear GSALU:

As a leader at your College, it is certain that you are busy and your time is valuable. I am very aware (as an employee of a community college) of time constraints, so I will be brief.

I am a doctoral candidate at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. I have completed the first three chapters of the dissertation, and I am working on the final two. The subject of this dissertation is "Institutional Climate, Employee Morale, and Institutional Effectiveness." The primary hypothesis is that climate surveys may be utilized to identify areas of potential concern prior to the visit of the reaffirmation committee. Timely identification of areas in which recommendations might be received may enable strategic planners at the institution to take corrective action, thus preventing recommendations.

I would like to make an appointment for a telephone interview with you to determine your perceptions of the results of the climate survey completed in 1992-93. (A list of the interview questions is enclosed.) Should you agree to participate, and I hope you will, please select from the dates and times listed at the bottom of this letter a convenient time (and an alternate) for me to call you. You may e-mail your selected date and time to connieb_jd2@ioa.com; circle your choices and return in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope; or you may fax your response to me at (704) 251-6718. If you wish to write responses to the questions, you may use the enclosed interview questions to write your responses and return it after we have completed the telephone interview. All information received will be kept confidential. I will also be happy to share the results of the study with you if you wish.

I will appreciate any assistance you may provide in this endeavor, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Connie S. Buckner

Enclosure

Telephone Appointment - (Please select a first choice and an alternate; I will fax or mail a confirmation. If none of these times is convenient, please indicate below a day and time convenient for you.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 27</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>August 28</td>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td>August 29</td>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Interview Questions
Interview Questions

1. To what extent did you agree that the top priorities for change identified by the Pace Climate Survey was an accurate assessment?

2. What priorities for change or "problem" areas identified by the survey were also addressed by the reaffirmation team either in recommendations or suggestions?

3. What problems were identified by faculty and staff responses to the survey of which you and other employees/leaders planners might not have been fully aware?

4. How accurately, in your judgement, did the survey portray your college climate?

5. How did the results of the survey compare with your expectations when it was decided that a survey was needed?

6. How were the survey results utilized in planning and decision making at your college?

7. In retrospect, would earlier and/or more frequent administration of a climate survey have been of benefit to your college in the reaffirmation process? Please elaborate.
8. What do you feel contributed to employees' "level of ownership" in the mission of the College?
APPENDIX E

Verification of Peer Review of Data
October 29, 1996

Ms. Connie Buckner  
151 Laurel Haven Road  
Fairview, NC 28730

Dear Ms. Buckner:

It was a pleasure for me to review your dissertation and verify the objectivity of your analysis. I found your reporting of the interviews, the self study, the client survey and the reaffirmation report to be unbiased and factually consistent with my reading of the same documents.

Please accept my best wishes for the successful completion of your doctoral work at East Tennessee State University.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Franklin, Ed. D.  
Joseph W. Franklin, Ed. D.  
Dean: Business & Hospitality Education Division
VITA

Connie S. Buckner

Personal Data: Date of Birth: March 19, 1951
Place of Birth: Big Pine, North Carolina
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Secretary, Student Services, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College, Asheville, North Carolina, 1978-1982

Director of Admissions, Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College, Asheville, North Carolina, 1982-1996

Director of the Madison Campus of Asheville-Buncombe Technical Community College, Asheville, North Carolina, 1997-Present.
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